Budget Narrative

<u>**Personnel**</u>

The amount in the budget for personnel reflects the costs of supporting existing Idaho Department of Education staff to participate in the activities of the proposed project. The Year 1 budget is based on actual salaries. A very conservative 2% raise is added each year in Year 2 and Year 3. Because this project is focused on needs identified in the proposal, all Bureau of Special Education staff members will be devoting a portion of their time to the *Partnering for Success* project.

Project Director: Jana L. Jones, Ed.D.
        Dr. Jones, Bureau Chief of Special Education, will allocate 20% of her time to the overall management and oversight of the *Partnering for Success* project. She will participate in the development of (1) the learning community concept, (2) coaching training and (3) leadership training. She will participate on the evaluation committees.

Project Coordinator: Russell M. Hammond, M.S.
        Mr. Hammond will devote 75% of his time to serve as the day-to day manager of the proposed project. He will oversee the performance of the project's subcontractors and will coordinate the project evaluation activities with the project evaluator. He will coordinate with the Math and Science Partnership in the Department. The grant will fund 50% of his salary.

Transition Coordinator: Jacque Hyatt, M.Ed.
        Ms. Hyatt will allocate 50% of her time to coordinate all secondary transition activities outlined in the grant proposal. She will be responsible for formalizing all partnerships with the adult service agencies. She will participate in the Evaluation Partnership.

Reading/Early Childhood Coordinator: Mary Bostick, Ph.D
        Dr. Bostick will work with the Idaho Reading First, Idaho Reading Initiative, Family Literacy and Early Literacy to ensure that reading interventions are coordinated within the Department. She will devote 30% of her time to the activities in the grant. She will be involved with the recruitment of early childhood special education teacher vacancies in targeted districts.

Transition Liaison: Larry Streeter, Ed.S.
        Mr. Streeter will work closely with Ms. Hyatt on secondary transition issues. He will spend 15% of his time on grant activities. He will serve as a liaison with disability organizations to ensure they actively participate in grant activities.

Data Specialist: E. Jean Taylor, M.S.
        Ms. Taylor will be responsible for providing available data to Department staff and partners for formative and summative evaluation purposes. She will use data provided from

the project as part of the Annual Performance Report to the Office of Special Education Programs. She will also be responsible for revising the monitoring self-evaluation materials based on project recommendations. She will spend 20% her time on project activities.

Data/Accounting Analyst: Lester Wyer

Mr. Wyer will contribute 25% of his time as the analyst charged with providing accounting support for the grant. He will also provide staff and partners with pertinent data that he is responsible for analyzing and reporting.

Gifted/Talented Specialist: Valerie Schorzman, Ed.D.

Dr. Schorzman will allocate 15% of her time to assist in the identification of students who are twice exceptional. She will also participate in the RBM learning communities and reading and math intervention learning communities focused on differentiated instructional strategies.

Senior Administrative Assistant: Bonnie Steiner-Leavitt

Ms. Leavitt will devote 100% of her time to *Partnering for Success* activities. She will provide direct support to the Project Coordinator and the RBM Training Coordinator.

Results Based Model Training Coordinator: Wayne Callender, M.S.

One hundred person of Mr. Callender's time will be devoted to the development and implementation of the RBM learning community. This will include all core and advanced RBM training. He will collaborate with all math and reading intervention work groups to ensure that there is coordination in information provided in RBM trainings.

Regional Special Education Consultants

The line items for Regional Special Education Consultants are found under the Institutions of Higher Education Subgrants. Regional consultants are contracted personnel who are hired by the universities, but work as an extension program of the Idaho Department of Education. There are nine regional consultants housed in five locations across the state. These consultants will provide valuable support to the project by participating in the learning community workgroups and serving as external support to the coaches in the areas of intervention, new teacher, transition and IEPs. Specific background information is provided in the personnel section of the proposal. Resumes are also located in the Appendix B.

Fringe

The amount in this line item reflects the cost of fringe benefits for project personnel.

Contract for Services

The amount in this line item reflects the costs for contracting with individuals or for buying a portion of an individual's contracted time to provide coaching to individuals or teams in the areas of intervention, new teacher support, secondary transition or IEPs. It is expected that the coaches will require 5 days of initial training and have 10 days available for coaching for a

total of 15 days per person. The numbers of coaches in some areas increase as noted in the budget in Years 2 and 3. All new coaches will be contracted for 15 days. Existing coaches will receive a contract for 13 days the second and third year because they will not have to repeat the initial training.

While not written as an in-kind item in the budget, it should be noted that the Department is contracting with the Center on Reading Excellence (CORE) to provide elementary and secondary five-day reading trainings throughout the state during the 2004-2005 school year. These trainings will support the work of the intervention learning community.

Travel

Employee Travel

The amount in this line item will support travel to a 2-day Project Director's meeting in Washington D.C. annually. It will also provide some travel for staff to carry out the activities of the proposed project. Additional travel costs will be paid with in-kind funds.

Non-Employee Travel

The amount in this item reflects the cost of travel for individuals who are not employees of the Department. These individuals include parents and other interested individuals who will participate with the various work groups convening to accomplish the goals of the proposed project. The costs include mileage, per diem, lodging and airfare. Costs are highest in Year 1 of the project and decrease significantly in Years 2 and 3.

Travel costs reflect Idaho's geography and sparse population. Idaho is the 13th largest state by area but only ranks 41st by population. It is 479 mountainous miles from the north to south and 305 miles wide at the widest point. As a result, project participants will often require air travel (which is expensive due to limited in-state competition) or lodging before or after a one-day meeting because of long driving times or limited air schedules. For this reason, project meetings are typically scheduled for two-day periods with significant preparation and follow-up being accomplished via mail, email, teleconferencing or web casting.

This item also supports the costs for travel, per diem, lodging, childcare and loss of wages for representatives from parent organizations from across the state to come to a Parent Summit each year to share information and receive information about critical issues that impact students with disabilities and their families.

Supplies/Operating

<u>Postage, Telephone, Printing</u>

The total in-kind contribution in this line item will support the various mailings and correspondence; telephone calls, teleconferences, and web casting; and printing and photocopying that will be needed to accomplish the proposed project.

Professional Development for Project Staff

The in-kind amount that is shown on this line will support professional development of SDE staff so they can gain the skills they need to assist in the implementation of the goals of the project. This includes participating in training related to reading and math interventions and secondary transition strategies.

<u>Training Costs</u>

This line item, which includes significant in-kind contributions, will cover the costs of conducting training activities as identified in the project, such as coaching and leadership in RBM or IEPs. This line item will cover the costs for meeting rooms, refreshments, substitutes and speaker honorariums.

<u>Indirect</u>

This total reflects the current rate of indirect costs charged by the Idaho Department of Education for federal grants.

Local Education Agency Subgrants

The amount in this line will support subgrants to schools that are participating in the proposed activities. Specifically, these dollars will provide funding for up to 25 RBM sites each year. These funds can be used to support team attendance at core and advanced training. There is also a significant in-kind contribution to provide ongoing support to the existing sites for up to one year.

The other subgrants to districts will be for secondary transition. Districts who have completed the *Taxonomy of Transition Programming* as part of the self-evaluation process for state monitoring will be able to apply for dollars to support improvement planning. The Department makes available continuous improvement grants to districts following an on-site visit. Districts can apply for these additional project funds to target secondary transition activities.

Idaho Parents Unlimited Subgrants

This amount will be used to support professional development for IPUL staff in project areas and provide support for staff time and travel to participate in learning community development and implementation. It will also provide funding for the production of parent materials that would support the learning communities. This line item, along with an in-kind contribution, provides for statewide parent scholarships to support parent travel, lodging, per diem, childcare and registration to conferences and workshops.

Institutions of Higher Education Subgrants

This line item will provide funding to four universities for the following purposes: (1) provide for faculty time and travel costs to develop and participate in the identified learning communities; (2)provide for faculty release time through a stipend or course buy-out to provide technical assistance to schools in an area of interest; (3) provide for the facilitation of a regional youth workshop on access to postschool education and employment opportunities and (4) purchase of curriculum to support the workshops.

The in-kind item under the Institutions of Higher Education Subgrants regarding regional consultant coaching time was discussed in the personnel section.

This item also supports the College of Southern Idaho in pursuing the development of an articulation agreement from its paraprofessional program to the four supported state universities and college. It also supports the College's development and provision of paraprofessional training in the areas of reading and math interventions.

The University of Kansas will be funded through this item to assist in the development and expansion of the secondary transition learning community by providing access to online and face-to-face transition training and technical assistance.

Web-based Teacher Recruitment System Subgrant

Nine districts in Idaho have over 60% of the special education teachers on emergency certification. This line item will focus support from a web-based teacher recruitment company, Teachers-Teachers.com to facilitate a broad based recruitment effort. These nine districts will be support for the three-year grant period. If the effort is successful, other funds will be identified to support other districts in the second and third year.

Idaho Training Clearinghouse Subgrant

The amount in this line item will support a subgrant to the Center on Disabilities Human Development to support the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC). This subgrant will provide for staff support and travel to develop and implement web-based learning communities in the areas of RBM, reading and math interventions, new teacher supports, IEPs and secondary

transition. The ITC will also continue to provide calendaring of professional development events and of the state needs assessment.

Idaho Association of School Administrators Subgrant

This line item will be used to contract with the Idaho Association of School Administrators to develop and provide ongoing leadership training in the areas of new teacher support, RBM, reading and math interventions and secondary transition to superintendents, elementary and secondary principals and special education directors.

Evaluation Contract

This line item supports the travel costs and per diem of the Evaluation Partnership meeting three times per year with the contracted evaluator to conduct a formative assessment. It also includes support for travel costs and per diem of the Evaluation Advisory Committee to meet one time per year with the evaluator to review the summative evaluation.

The amount in this line item also supports a subgrant with REA Systems to conduct the formative and summative evaluation of the project in collaboration with the Evaluation Partnership and the Evaluation Advisory Committee. This includes time and expenses.

READER'S+69
GUIDE

Contents	Page
PART I: Application for Federal Assistance	ii
PART II: Budget Information	viii
Abstract	
PART III: Application Narrative	xxv

Need for Project:
    Specific gaps in services, infrastructure or opportunities
    Magnitude of gaps and weaknesses
	1

Significance of Project:
    System change
    Improvement
	25

Project Design:
    Project Design
    Goals, objective and outcomes
	35

Project Personnel:
    Qualifications and experience of key project personnel
    Qualifications and experience of project consultants
	58

Adequacy of Resources
    Organization resources
    Partner commitment
    Adequacy and reasonableness of budget
    Commitment for continued support
	64

Management Plan
    Adequacy of management plan
    Defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones
	76

Project Evaluation
    Method of evaluation
    Use of evaluation data
	87

PART IV: Assurances and Certification	92

APPENDICES
  A Bibliography
  B: Vitae
  C: Letters of Partnership
  D: Other	

Abstract

Student achievement is more than the accumulation of test scores that indicate proficiency in a variety of subject areas. Meaningful student achievement is what a student *does* with his or her knowledge and skills. Educators must be mindful of how of the mix of educational programs and personnel will best prepare a student for postschool opportunities in employment, postsecondary education and community opportunities. Preparing a student for postschool opportunities does not begin as a student approaches graduation; rather, it is part of a student's entire educational career (Pre-K through grade 12). This project is designed to ensure improved postschool outcomes for students with disabilities through goals that address the following:

- An adequate supply of highly qualified professionals;
- Educational teams, which include parents, that have the knowledge and skills to provide effective interventions and supports to students with disabilities in the areas of reading and mathematics;
- An education and adult service system that provides effective secondary transition services and supports that prepare students for successful postschool outcomes; and
- Effective administration, systematic evaluation and continuous improvement of the project through partnerships with critical stakeholders.

The outcome of these ambitious goals will be an education system that supports highly qualified professionals who are able to provide reading and math interventions that allow each student to achieve his or her full potential. In addition, education and adult service agencies will have developed a strong state and local system of services and supports that increase positive postschool opportunities for youth with disabilities in the areas of employment, postsecondary education and community participation.

A. Need for Project

The needs section of this grant proposal is presented in two parts: the first part consists of a broad summary of needs; the second part identifies specific needs that form the focus of the *Partnering for Success* project.

1. Geographic and Demographic Challenges

Idaho, the thirteenth largest state, is a sparsely populated rural state, deriving its revenue primarily from agriculture. Idaho covers 83,557 square miles, of which 64% is federally owned. Many areas within Idaho are considered *remote* rather than *rural*. Only 53% of Idaho's roads are paved. Accessibility in travel and technology is a challenge.

Twenty-three of the 44 counties have eight or fewer people per square mile. Idaho ranks 14th in the nation in terms of states with rural schools. Fifty percent of the Idaho schools are located in rural areas. Ninety percent of Idaho's 114 school districts provide education to fewer than 5,000 students. Half of all districts serve less than 1,000 students.

Among Idaho's 1.2 million residents, 17.2% are considered economically disadvantaged. The average per capita income in Idaho is $17,841. Idaho residents generate a low tax base, and the state historically ranks 47th in the nation in terms of per pupil expenditures for public schools.

The gradual economic decline of lumber and mining and the more recent decline of the technology sector have eroded state tax revenues, resulting in the lowest percentage of state spending for education in twenty years. In 2002, for the first time in Idaho's history, Legislators reduced the level of public school funding midway through the school year. The following year, the Legislature allocated an increase of only 1.14% in the general fund for public schools.

Idaho's geographic and economic conditions present unique challenges for education. While the state allocates relatively few resources for public education, it offers a rich pool of invested citizens who aggressively engage themselves in efforts to improve the education results for children and youth, including those with disabilities. In spite of these efforts, children and youth with disabilities are not experiencing positive outcomes in comparison to their peers. Idaho's performance goals and indicators (see Appendix D) focus on student outcomes and adequate supply of highly qualified personnel. An analysis of the current status on those indicators are discussed in each of the need areas.

2. *Analysis of Other Information on Effectiveness of Early Intervention, Special Education and General Education*

Early Intervention: Idaho Part C and Part B programs have been diligently working to improve the transition of eligible children from the infant toddler program to school programs. With assistance from the General Supervision Enhancement Grant from the Office of Special Education Programs, the Idaho Infant Toddler Program and the Idaho Department of Education worked collaboratively to (1) develop an integrated data system, (2) align state policies to facilitate transition, (3) develop indicators of transition, (4) revise the state interagency agreement and (5) train statewide on the changes. As a result of this work, the number of children receiving special education services at age three has increased steadily over the past three years. Determinations of eligibility at transition are more efficient, and fewer children are falling through the cracks as they approach transition from Part C to Part B.

Special education programs served 2,192 children in the 3-4 year old age range during the 2002-2003 school year. Preschool programs served only 30.5% of special education students in the regular early childhood setting more than 80% of the time, which is less than the

national average of 36.2%. Idaho does not have state-funded preschool programs for *all* children; most school district preschool programs are only for children with disabilities. To remedy the lack of service for preschool children, representatives from Part C, Part B and the institutions of higher education collaborated on how to blend early childhood and early childhood special education course content. This activity resulted in approval of a Blended Early Childhood/Special Education certificate and implementation of preservice programs to prepare teachers to work with *all* children, birth through grade three.

Special Education: The statewide rate for identification of special education on the December 1, 2002, child count of publicly enrolled students is 26,932 students, or 10.8% of children 5-21 years of age. Other factors regarding special education students include the following:

- *Least restrictive environment*: 62.4% of all special education students were served in the regular classroom greater than 80% of the time compared to the national average of 47.3%.

- *Identification:* Twenty-two of the 114 school districts identify 13% or more of their students as eligible for special education.

- *Suspension/Expulsion:* For the past five years an average of less than .40% of students with disabilities have been suspended or expelled for more than ten days per year.

- *Assessment Scores*: Statewide assessment scores are significantly lower for students with disabilities, but there has been steady improvement in those scores over the past three years.

Idaho is addressing the specific needs of students with disabilities in the area of positive behavioral supports and assistive technology (AT) through two projects funded by the Bureau of Special Education. These two statewide funded projects provide timely direct technical assistance and support to school teams to assist in the development and implementation of behavior and AT plans. Since 1998, the Positive Behavioral Supports project has served 80-90 students per school year with direct support to school personnel and students by a consultant. This year, two school districts are implementing the Positive Behavioral Supports project in all schools. Since 1993 the Assistive Technology Project has provided statewide training on AT assessments, services and equipment. It also contracts with individuals certified to provide assistive technology to students. In 2003 the Assitive Technology Project conducted 64 AT assessments for individual students in Idaho public schools and provided 40 follow-up visits after the assessments.

General Education: The Department of Education has successfully implemented the Idaho Achievement Standards in all districts through a rigorous standards-based reform process begun in 2001. While districts are at different levels of implementation, most districts have aligned their curriculum to the state standards and are well into implementation at all grade levels. A goal of all schools and districts in Idaho is school improvement focused on improved student outcomes. The Idaho Department of Education is working Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability to coordinate all school improvement activities through the accreditation process.

The Idaho Reading Initiative and support for technology in public schools has received funding from the Idaho Legislature. The Idaho Reading Initiative led to (1) the creation of the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) given at grades K-3, (2) intensive teacher training in grades 1-

4

3, (3) intervention programs based on IRI scores and (4) a comprehensive literacy course that all Idaho educators must take. Funding for technology has supported the purchase of equipment for all Idaho classrooms and the implementation of a technology exam that all Idaho teachers are required to pass to maintain certification.

On the 2002-2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), Idaho students did very well when compared to national scores. In 4th grade, 64% of the students scored above basic in reading compared to 62% at the national level; and 80% scored above basic in math compared to 76% at the national level. In 8th grade, 76% of students scored above basic in reading compared to 72% at the national level; and 73% scored above basic in math compared to 67% at the national level.

3. *Integration of state activities*

Accountability for all students, including students with disabilities, in public education programs is a priority at all levels of the educational system. With that, improved outcomes for all students has become the focus of many federal, state and local initiatives. At the state level these initiatives include the State Accountability Plan, IMOST (Idaho Maximizing Opportunities for Students and Teachers), Title I School Improvement, Preparation of Paraprofessionals Project, Special Education Results Based Model, Idaho Reading Initiative, Reading First, the Math and Science Partnership Program, Standards Implementation, and Accreditation. Several of these initiative have been accomplished by collaboration with various partners, specifically (1) the development and implementation of teacher standards coordinated by the Idaho Board of Education, the Idaho Department of Education and institutions of higher education; (2) the development and implementation of paraprofessional standards and assessments coordinated by the Bureau of Federal Programs and the Bureau of

Special Education; and (3) implementation of the Idaho Achievement Standards coordinated between all bureaus within the Idaho Department of Education, school districts, institutions of higher education and the J.A. and Kathyrn Albertson Foundation Additionally, the Idaho Department of Education coordinated with the Reading First Project and the Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability to provide special education teachers with reading academies that are aligned to the reading academies provided to 1st, 2nd, and 3rd grade general education teachers.

Although many federal, state and local initiatives are directed at student outcomes, these initiatives often lack the coordination necessary to promote the effective use of resources. Lack of coordination has led to systemic barriers for districts and schools as they attempt to meet the needs of all students within a maze of initiative requirements. Further, lack of coordination causes a duplication of effort at state and local levels in terms of money spent and energy used to address similar needs in districts. The Idaho Department of Education has only 71 professional staff members to implement all state education programs—from school finance, technology, motorcycle safety and school lunches to implementation of achievement standards, the No Child Left Behind Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

4. *Analysis of Parent Involvement*

Involving parents in the education process of their child is a high priority of the Idaho Department of Education. The Bureau of Special Education has worked collaboratively with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) to develop collaborative training modules and standards for parent involvement. In addition to collaborative training, IPUL provides multiple services to families in Idaho through (1) individualized, one-on-one assistance to families of children

with disabilities from birth to age 21; (2) a statewide toll-free telephone line at no cost to parents; (3) regional workshops designed to inform families and others on special education laws and other topics relevant to raising a child with a disability; and (4) written materials and general information about disabilities. IPUL reports that for the past three years over 60% of parent who contact the for support are parents of children with attention deficit disorder, mental retardation, learning disabilities and autism. In 2002-2003 parent participation in the IEP process increased from 88% to 91%, and participation in the eligibility determination process increased from 69% to 80%. (State Improvement Plan, 2002). In addition, 1999 through 2003, the number of complaints and hearings has been reduced from 37 to 28 per year.

5. *Analysis of Findings from State Compliance Review*

State Improvement Plan

Through the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process, Idaho stakeholders completed the self-evaluation process during 2001, which was followed by a verification visit from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in January 2002. While there were no findings of non-compliance by OSEP, Idaho was committed to continuous improvement in services to students with disabilities and developed an improvement plan with three goals focused on outcomes. These broad goals are as follows:

- Idaho will include stakeholders in the decision-making process at all levels (individual, building, district, and state) to ensure improved outcomes for students with disabilities and gifted/talented (G/T) students.

- Personnel in Idaho will be trained to ensure that all students with disabilities and gifted/talented students at all age levels receive appropriate services in the least restrictive environments.

- Student outcomes will improve as a result of Bureau of Special Education leadership and effective general supervision of special education and gifted/talented services in Idaho.

- Data from the indicators collected for these goal areas have been addressed in the analysis of student needs, analysis of professional development needs and analysis of parent needs.

6. *Barriers*

One of the primary barriers to coordinated efforts that focus on improvement for all students in Idaho is making collaboration time a priority within and among all agencies. The Idaho Department of Education is not the only agency with a small number of personnel who have several large roles and many responsibilities. It is also true for all partner agencies. Interagency collaboration that is based on a common vision reduces costly duplication of efforts and confusion of parents accessing services. Other barriers to coordinated efforts include (1) the lack of consistent use of data for informing decisions and (2) the lack of access to consistent training and support.

The comprehensive analysis of all information reasonably available on the performance of students with disabilities, professional development needs, state improvement plan results, parents needs, identified barriers and other pertinent information have identified the following needs targeted in this grant proposal:

1. An adequate supply of highly qualified personnel working in Idaho schools is needed to ensure improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

2. The educational team, which includes parents, needs the skills and knowledge to provide a structure for effective interventions in reading and math.

3. The educational system and adult service agencies needs to provide effective secondary transition services and supports that prepare students for successful post school outcomes.

Need 1: An adequate supply of highly qualified personnel working in Idaho schools is needed to ensure improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

Postschool opportunities depend on the knowledge and skills attained during a student's educational career (K-12). With this in mind, the importance of having an adequate supply of highly qualified teachers cannot be overstated. Researchers have consistently demonstrated that the quality of classroom teaching is the most profound influence on student achievement (Reeves, 2002). The No Child Left Behind Act reinforced this idea when it required that all core subjects be taught by highly qualified teachers by 2006.

Analysis of Professional Development Needs

Number of Qualified Personnel

Idaho must have an adequate supply of fully certified special education teachers to improve student achievement and promote the long-term goal of successful post school outcomes for students with disabilities. The percentage of fully certificated special education teachers lags significantly below the percentage of all fully certificated teachers (special and general education combined). This situation is exacerbated by the fact that Idaho is experiencing a downward trend in the number of fully certificated special education teachers. In 2001-2002, the number of fully certificated special education personnel, including related

service providers was 91.7% compared to 97.8 % for all teachers in Idaho (Idaho Basic Education Data System, 2001-2002). The number of fully certificated special education personnel has decreased for the past three years, from 94.9% beginning in 1999-2000 to 91.7% to 2001-2002. (Idaho State Report Card; State Improvement Plan Report, July 2003)

The number of emergency teaching contracts has nearly doubled in the recent years, and graduation rates for individuals receiving certification in special education is declining. The number of emergency contracts for the K-12 special education generalist position has gone from 54 for 1999-2000 to 106 for 2002-2003, an increase of 196%. Considering all available data regarding retention rates and projected graduates from Idaho institutions of higher education, it is expected that the number of emergency contracts will increase to 209 by the beginning of the 2006-2007 school year. All emergency contracts for 2002-2003 were in 26 of the 114 school districts in Idaho. Sixty percent of the emergency contracts occurred in 9 school districts in Idaho.

Like other states, Idaho has relied increasingly upon paraprofessionals as a valued member of the educational team in meeting the needs of students with disabilities. The number employed in Idaho schools has increased by 33% over the past four years to 2062. In response to this, Idaho has adopted standards; developed an Associate of Applied Science degree program for paraprofessionals; and the Legislature is considering a bill to create an alternate pathway into teacher certification.

Anticipated Vacancies/Shortages

All teaching vacancies are filled by certificated personnel or by personnel on emergency certification. Approximately 8% of special education positions are filled by emergency certification (State Improvement Plan Report, July 2003) compared to only 2% for all

teaching positions in the state (Idaho State Report Card). The growth rate for new special education positions is 2-3% per year (Report to the Idaho Legislature, 2002). At this rate of growth, there will be a potential increase of 120 new special education positions by 2006-2007.

Anticipated Retention

Highly qualified teachers must be retained if students with disabilities are to gain the instructional supports they require to meet postschool goals. The annual retention rate of special education personnel has improved over the past three years from 89% to 92%. However, the increase in the retention rate is offset by attrition and fewer graduates. Idaho must continue to improve those conditions that drive highly qualified special education teachers out of the field. A recent survey, "Special Education Teacher Retention Survey," conducted by an Idaho graduate student sampled former special education teachers who had transferred to general education teaching positions in the same Idaho district. The 77 respondents identified working conditions that influenced their decision to leave special education. On a five-point scale where number "5" represents a strong impact and number one no impact, the survey produced the following results: paperwork (4.2); caseload size (3.7); time required (3.5); feelings of futility (3.5); feelings of isolation (2.8); no advancement opportunities (2.5); lack of administrative support (2.4); managing assistants (2.3).

These findings are not dissimilar from national research on the retention of special education teachers. A special education teacher is more likely to experience job satisfaction when he or she is enabled to spend more meaningful time teaching and less time dealing with paperwork and when the administration supports in environment of collegial partnerships. Gersten, Keating, Yovanoff and Harniss "found that in special education, stress due to poor

job design is found in the discrepancy between what teachers believe about their jobs (i.e., that they are there to teach children with disabilities) and the realities of their jobs (i.e., burdensome paperwork loads, extensive time spent in meetings, limited opportunities for individualization, and huge ranges in student performance levels)."

The current rate of attrition for special education teachers in Idaho is at 8% per year (State Improvement Plan Report, July 2003). This percentage takes into account all reasons for leaving positions, including moved to another state, retired, left the profession, took a different assignment, etc. At the current rate of attrition Idaho will have to replace approximately 318 teachers over the next three years.

Idaho institutions of higher education report a downward trend in the number of anticipated graduates in the field of special education. The total projected number of Idaho graduates earning a special education degree for the next three years is 197. Based on history, only 60% of these graduates, or 118 graduates, will be employed in public education in Idaho (Idaho Department of Education, Educator Supply and Demand in Idaho, July 2003). Up to 217 positions, or 40%, of the 544 positions needed might be filled by out-of-state applicants, leaving a balance of 209 unfilled teaching positions. This suggests that the number of emergency teaching contracts will almost double in the next three years.

Policy and Procedure Needs

Increases in caseload sizes lead directly to decreases in teacher effectiveness related to the planning, delivery and evaluation of instruction. The effectiveness of even highly qualified special education teachers is diminished when their caseloads are too high. Some teachers may choose to opt out of the profession rather than continue the daily struggle of have to "make do" with an insufficient amount of time to adequately serve students. Either

12

way—whether teachers struggle to keep up or simple quit out of frustration—student achievement, including the long-term goal of postschool success, suffers. In 1996 there was a change in Idaho code regarding the funding of school personnel that had a dramatic impact on caseload sizes. During the 1995-1996 school year the average caseload was 15 students per special education teacher. The following school year, caseloads rose to 24. The average caseload in Idaho is now 26; the national average is 18 students per special education teacher. Currently there are 280 special education teachers in Idaho who have caseloads over 25, of these, 25 teachers who have caseloads over 40. To address this area, there is a need to develop a State Board of Education rule regarding caseload size for special education teachers.

Collaboration with Other States

Idaho honors certifications from all other states and provides these persons with a three-year interim certification. During that three-year period these personnel must demonstrate competency in technology and comprehensive literacy by passing state required assessments in these areas. In the spring of 2002 Idaho identified the need to prepare teachers to work with students who are visually impaired. In cooperation with other states and Stephen F. Austin University, Idaho is utilizing distance learning to address this need. To date, 2 teachers have completed the program and are employed in Idaho schools. Seventeen other individuals are currently enrolled in the program.

Professional Development Needs

Teachers need ongoing training to remain current on best practices and scientifically based research to improved teacher instruction and student achievement. Teaching based on scientifically based research ensures that students are prepared not only for the insular world

of the school environment, but (1) have access to the ideas prevalent in society at large and (2) are prepared to engage these ideas as encountered in employment, postsecondary education and community participation. The Bureau of Special Education utilizes the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC), which is a project developed through the last State Improvement Grant, to conduct ongoing professional development needs assessments. Data compiled by the ITC from July 1, 2002 through April 30, 2003 showed that 8% of the participants were parents, 8% were administrators and 25% were general education teachers. The remaining participants consisted of public and private special education and related service personnel. The training priorities identified from the needs assessment are, in rank order, (1) response to intervention, (2) literacy, (3) behavior interventions (4) IEP training and (5) early childhood transition.

Summary of Needs

Accounting for growth, emergency certifications and attrition, it is estimated that Idaho may need a total need of 544 special education teachers by the 2006-2007 school year. Issues leading to difficulty with recruitment and retention must be addressed; otherwise, students with disabilities are at risk of poor post school outcomes due to lack of access to highly qualified teachers. More parents and administrators need to be involved in professional development activities that lead to improved outcomes for students in areas such as reading and mathematics.

Need 2: Educational teams, which include parents, need the skills and knowledge to provide effective educational interventions and supports in reading and math to students with disabilities.

Student achievement in reading and math is critical for post school opportunities such as employment and postsecondary education, as well as ordinary activities of living such as driving and grocery shopping. However students with disabilities score significantly lower on statewide reading and math assessments than students without disabilities. The Idaho Reading Initiative and Reading First have begun to improve results for children through improved assessment and instruction. However, special education personnel have not always participated in training, and many systemic barriers block implementation of research-based reading practices, including: (1) lack of widespread acceptance and use of research-based curricula in general and special education, (2) lack of supplemental and intervention use by special educators, (3) lack of scheduling for intensive periods of instruction and (4) lack of coordination of efforts across general education, special education and Title I. The Math and Science Initiative has just begun, and converging research on math instruction is just emerging nationwide. Idaho must actively seek to provide training and ongoing technical assistance to all teachers in these areas, and coordinate efforts among all state improvement initiatives to improve results for children, pre-kindergarten through age 21.

Analysis of Student Needs

Statewide Assessment Data Compared to Non-disabled Students

One indicator of student achievement is demonstrating proficiency on statewide achievement assessments. The Idaho assessment system includes the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) and the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IAA) Results from the spring 2003 ISAT combined with the IAA are used by the state f. or determining adequate yearly progress in the areas of reading and math. The results

of non-disabled students compared to students with disabilities on the combined tests can be

found on the following table.

Table 1: Comparison of ISAT/IAA Results for Disabled and Non-disabled Students

Subject/ Grade	% Proficient		% Participation	
	Students with Disabilities	Students without Disabilities	Students with Disabilities	Students without Disabilities
Reading 4th Grade	34%	80%	98.79%	99.18%
Math 4th Grade	43%	81%	98.94%	99.68%
Reading 8th Grade	26%	78%	98.09%	99.23%
Math 8th Grade	10%	57%	98.53%	99.05%
Reading 10th Grade	23%	78%	97.2%	98.84%
Math 10th Grade	19%	75%	96.91%	98.64%

The combined results for the ISAT and IAA show that participation rates of students with disabilities is comparable to their non-disabled peers, but the proficiency ratings are significantly lower in both reading and in math at all grade levels.

The Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) is a 10-minute screener given three times a year in grades K-3 to help classroom teachers identify students who may be at risk for reading difficulties. Results from the IRI are publicly reported. Similar to results from other statewide assessments, results for the IRI show a significant gap between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers (see Table 2 below).

Table 2: Comparison of IRI results

Grade Level	% Proficient All Students	% Proficient Students with Disabilities
K	49%	32%
1	78%	47%
2	57%	21%
3	53%	15%

Results Based Model (Response-to-Intervention)

Traditionally, students with learning challenges had to "wait to fail" (typically until grade 3) before teachers would recognize the problem and refer the student to special education. This model led to late identification of students who needed interventions, delay in the delivery of interventions to students, and the use of identification measures that were not linked to instruction (Vaughn & Fuchs, 2002). An approach labeled response-to-intervention leads to identification of students based on risk rather than deficit, early identification and instruction, and of assessment linked with instruction planning. As part of the last State Improvement Grant, Idaho embarked on the implementation of a prereferral, or response-to-intervention, system called the Results Based Model (RBM) (See Appendix D). This system

responds to students' academic and behavioral needs in a timely manner through the development of an intervention plan. One of the requirements of the system is progress monitoring to measure the impact and effectiveness of the intervention. Idaho has implemented the model in 80 of the 648 schools in the state.

A study in 2003 looked at the impact of RBM's systematic problem-solving approach regarding reading performance on the Idaho Reading Indicator—a statewide assessment given three times a year to students in grades K-3—in pilot schools. The study compared two groups of students with similar reading problems; one group consisted of students who had intervention plans, the other group did not. The study revealed that students with intervention plans had a growth rate in reading at about the 88th percentile, compared to student with no intervention plans at the 50th percentile. In a separate study, teachers and administrators were surveyed regarding the impact of RBM in the pilot schools. The survey revealed the following:

- School staff members reported that they are increasingly more skilled at using best practices such as functional assessment, collaboration, outcome-oriented interventions, and data-based decision making, and that they are using these practices with a greater degree of refinement.
- RBM is positively associated with increased levels of teacher efficacy regarding a teacher's ability to effect positive learning outcomes with students.
- As the level of involvement increases with respect to participation in RBM, there is a robust and consistent association with increased parental involvement, functional assessment, and collaborative problem solving.

19

- Eighty-eight percent (88%) of administrators reported that student academic performance improved. Further, 81% of administrators indicated that student behavior issues improved since the implement of RBM.

- Outcome data indicates that RBM has had a powerful effect of expanding general education interventions and reducing special education placements.

Barriers identified by the Bureau of Special Education regarding statewide implementation of the Results Based Model include (1) lack of release time from schools for teams to participate in training (2) inadequate supply of personnel that can support the teams through implementation (3) lack of a policy that would require implementation of the RBM system in all schools, and (4) lack of time for meaningful coordination with other Idaho Department of Education initiatives. The grant proposal will address these barriers in the *Partnering for Success* project design.

Summary of Needs

While there has been steady improvement in the statewide assessment scores for students with disabilities, these students still score significantly below their non-disabled peers in reading and math. These two critical areas must be a priority for improving the results for all students, including students with disabilities, if they are to be successful in their post-school activities such as employment, postsecondary education and community participation. Personnel involved in RBM school sites will be trained in current research-based assessment and interventions in reading and math to improve student outcomes in these areas.

Need 3: Effective secondary transition services and supports needed to increase the number of youth with disabilities who are actively engaged in postsecondary education, employment and community activities.

Helping students with disabilities successfully meet state graduation requirements is a national goal. This goal will be reached only when highly qualified personnel are implementing research-based practices to meet the individual instructional needs of students with disabilities. An article titled *Give yourself the gift of a degree,* Doland (2001) states that individuals with no high school diploma have a 40 year earning potential of $852,577. Where an individual with a high school diploma has a 40 year earning potential of $1,222,396, a $369,818 gain.

Statewide Assessment Data Compared to Non-disabled Students

The achievement gap on statewide assessments between students with disabilities and students without disabilities at the middle school and high school level (see Table 1) becomes greater as students get older. Students reading at a 4th grade level cannot successfully access content area material at the secondary level. Students who have not mastered the use of all operations on while numbers, decimals and fractions cannot access algebra or career-based mathematics in vocational classes or on job sites. The need for IEP teams, which includes the student and parents, to make informed decisions during transition planning is magnified as the achievement gap grows.

Drop-out Rates and Graduation Rates

While there continues to be a significant difference between disabled and non-disabled students concerning graduation and drop out rates, the gap is narrowing. The graduation rate for students with disabilities has seen continuous improved over the past three years. From 1999-2000 to 2001-2002 the graduation rate for students with disabilities improved from 73% to 75%. During the same period the drop out rate for all students with disabilities in grades 9-12 improved from 6.5% to 4.9%.

Participation in Postsecondary Education and Employment

Appropriate transition planning for post-school education or employment is the key to student success. To measure the impact of transition planning, Idaho began contracting with a private agency to gather post-school outcome data from all students with disabilities in 2000. At graduation students are asked to anticipate what they will be doing after graduation. Follow-up data regarding their actual status is collected from these individuals at one- three- and five-year intervals following graduation. The most complete data is from the class of 2000, which has three complete data sets (see Table 3).

Table 3: Postsecondary education and employment class of 2000

Survey Question: Are you…	At Graduation *(Anticipated Status)*	1 year *(Actual Status)*	3 year *(Actual Status)*
Working full time?	34.8%	42.8%	45%
Working part time?	13.7%	19.8%	20.2%
Military?	6.9%	3.6%	3.8%
4-year college?	17.8%	8.9%	6.4%
2-year college?	17.5%	5.1%	2.3%
Voc/Tech School?	21.9%	4.4%	2.9%
Parenting?	-	4.8%	8.2%
Not working or going to school?	-	19.6%	18.4%

The data indicates that three years after graduation 69% of the students reporting are working or in the military while only 11.6% are in postsecondary education. Of those who are

working, only 34% make $8.00 or more an hour. Forty-seven percent (47%) are living with a parent or relative. Eighteen point four percent (18.4%) are unemployed and not going to school.

Policy and Procedure Needs

Idaho has not adopted policies and procedures that provide guidance to education personnel and parents regarding high-stakes testing. The State Board of Education in Idaho just adopted a rule (IDAPA 08.02.03.105.03) that requires that all high school students to achieve a proficient or advanced score on the High School Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) to graduate. The rule provides for an appeal process and alternate mechanisms students can use to demonstrate proficiency on statewide assessments. However, this high-stakes test presents an additional barrier for many students with disabilities and may have significant consequences in terms of post-school employment and postsecondary education opportunities. Guidelines regarding the development of graduation requirements for students with disabilities as part of the transition process will be needed.

Summary of Needs

Effective transition planning, beginning no later than 8th grade, is critical to ensure that students and families understand the expectations for high school graduation and can fully participate in the process. Transition teams must be thorough in considering accommodations and adaptations to coursework, grading and graduation requirements during transition planning. A lack of adequate attention to these details will result in low achievement test scores, which will have potentially devastating effects on graduation and direct impact on post-school outcomes. Passage of the state rule that requires proficiency in reading and math

23

on the High School ISAT adds to the complexity of achieving success for a student with a disability.

B. Significance

The partners in this grant are confident this plan will (1) result in significant systemic improvement, (2) build the local district capacity to provide, improve or expand services that address the needs of all students, including children and youth with disabilities (3) influence scaling-up system change efforts and (4) be sustained beyond the grant period.

In support of this position, *Partnering for Success* project partners reference and use as a guide the findings of Furney, Hasazi and Destefano (1997) on effective system change and the analysis of research on scaling-up reform efforts. Furney, Hasazi and Destefano state that effective change occurs when the following elements exist:

- Stakeholders share common values and beliefs;

- State and federal legislation supports ongoing efforts;

- Leadership and advocacy are united;

- Collaborative structures are in place at all levels;

- Results of research and evaluation are used to effect change efforts;

- Capacity is built for long-lasting change; and

- Links exist between the current initiatives and other restructuring efforts.

With these overarching themes as the guide, the state would like to demonstrate how each of these elements is present in the *Partnering for Success* project:

Stakeholders Share Common Values and Beliefs

This grant proposal is founded on core of values and beliefs that serve the following vision: Outcomes for Idaho students with disabilities will be improved. Stakeholders from across the state participated in the state self-assessment that resulted in a state improvement

plan. The state improvement plan calls for the Idaho Department of Education and partner agencies to focus on improved outcomes for all students. The plan led to the submission and award of a federal grant titled, *Targeting Relationships to Improve Results.* The vision of this grant proposal, *Partnering for Success*, takes all partners to the next level of commitment, not just *improving* results, but to the goal of *success* for all students with disabilities in the state of Idaho. This shared vision will serve as a bond between partners and will allow the partners to persevere in accomplishing project objectives.

State and Federal Legislation Supports Ongoing Efforts

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 1997, facilitated the development and monitoring of performance goals and indicators focused on improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Idaho's performance goals and indicators have set targets for the state and districts that center on (1) increased achievement on statewide assessments, (2) increased graduation rates, (3) decreased drop out rates and (4) increased number of fully certificated personnel. Over the past several years, the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, has changed its monitoring system to include student outcomes. Idaho, in turn, has changed its monitoring system to also include student outcomes.

The No Child Left Behind Act, 2002, has brought significant changes to schools with its focus on (1) accountability of the education system to the public, (2) highly qualified teachers, (3) parent involvement in the educational system, (4) student outcomes in reading and math and (5) school improvement. The No Child Left Behind Act has ensured that all students will be included in the accountability system and that schools, districts and states will be accountable for ensuring that they are all proficient in reading and math.

Newly adopted state accountability rules support the changes in the No Child Left Behind Act by focusing on student outcomes in reading and math and school improvement. Scores for students with disabilities are disaggregated and reported to the public. Schools are put into school improvement programs based on the proficiency ratings for all students and for subgroups of students, including students with disabilities.

Leadership and Advocacy Are United

In their study, Furney, Hasazi and Destefano found that systems change occurred where there was both "top-down" and "bottom-up" leadership in place. At the state level, leadership needs to support federal and state policies, promote interagency collaboration, track outcomes, and support innovative school and community programs. State leaders must be visionary, accessible and responsive to local needs. At the local level, Furney, Hasazi and Destfano concluded that there is a need for advocates (parents, teachers and community leaders) to speak out on behalf of students, lobby for legislative change, raise awareness of issues to be addressed, and create a voice for change. In partnership with the Idaho School Administrators Association (IASA) and institutions of higher education, the *Partnering for Success* project will support administrators to become powerful instructional leaders.

The Idaho Department of Education recognizes that "local control" is highly valued throughout the state. For change to occur across the state, there must be a match between the needs expressed from the bottom-up advocates and the vision of the top-down leadership. Promoting effective relationships between *Partnering for Success* project leaders and advocates has been strategically considered in the project's design and evaluation. The use of data to inform decisions has been a strong focus for the Idaho Department of Education in all standards implementation and school improvement activities. The *Partnering for Success*

27

project will support that focus by expanding the use of more functional data on student outcomes to inform and evaluate the activities and formulate policy decisions.

Collaborative structures are in place at all levels

The key to the success of any project is the quality of the relationships among those responsible for the outcomes. Many of the partnerships identified in the *Partnering for Success* project have been in place since the state self-evaluation in 2001. Several task force groups composed of stakeholders met during the self-evaluation process and continued working together as the process evolved into developing collaborative state improvement strategies. All task force groups had representation from parents, local education agencies, other service agencies, and institutions of higher education.

Effective ongoing partnerships developed through the *Partnering for Success* project will only add to and strengthen the effort to ensure success for students with disabilities. Partnerships developed for this grant are identified in each objective in the project design. Signed partnership agreements are also located in the Appendix C. The partnerships include a diverse mix of organizations and individuals at all levels and are intended to ensure a successful project.

Results of Research and Evaluation Are Used to Effect Change Efforts

The No Child Left Behind Act requires that instructional materials and practices in reading and math must have scientifically based research to support their effectiveness. Scientifically based research is defined as research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic and object procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs. The Idaho Department of Education will provide reliable and consistent information regarding research-based interventions for reading and math to Idaho

educators so that they will clearly understand (1) the definition of scientifically based research, (2) each scientifically based essential component of instruction and (3) the instructional programs and practices that research supports as most effective. The essential components of reading intervention promoted through the *Partnering for Success* project include phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension. The essential components of math intervention promoted through the *Partnering for Success* project include understanding mathematics, computing fluently, applying concepts to solve problems, reasoning logically, and engaging with mathematics. Reading and math interventions will be developed in collaboration with Idaho Reading First, the Idaho Reading Initiative, Title I and the Math and Science Partnership.

The Results Based Model used in Idaho (a response-to-intervention model) is based on the research of Bransford and Stein who published the IDEAL Problem Solver, 1993. The Results Based Model has been evaluated in Idaho pilot schools and has yielded improved outcomes for all students in schools where it has been implemented. Statewide implementation of the Results Based Model will lead to success for all students.

Curricula and programs do not teach students, teachers do. There is a significant amount of data suggesting that teacher quality is the most powerful predictor of student success (Sander, 1996, National Reading Panel, 1998). The learning communities, modeled after the communities of practice described by Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002) in *Cultivating Communities of Practice* provide school personnel and parents access to a greater depth of knowledge through ongoing interaction, rather than just a single training.

Capacity is Built for Long-Lasting Change

Despite having the elements in place to facilitate change, implementing a reform effort statewide offers additional challenges. Idaho has met this challenge with other state initiatives (e.g., implementation of the Idaho Standards for Excellence) and grant projects. A review of the research conducted by the North Central Regional Education Laboratory on implementing reform efforts statewide indicate that there are other critical elements that must be addressed to ensure statewide success. Those elements include the following: (1) a program design that is comprehensive, easy to understand and quickly implemented; (2) stakeholder buy-in at all levels; (3) adequate support provided during implementation; (4) effective leadership; (5) a monitoring system for quality assurance; (6) and a plan for networking and building constituencies for change.

The *Partnering for Success* project has put into place all of the elements necessary to enhance the ability of the Idaho Department of Education to implement the components of the project statewide. For instance, the Results Based Model will be expanded to include (1) a required stakeholder agreement for participation in the project, (2) leadership training for school administrators, (3) training for coaches who will provide ongoing in-district support for the project, (4) a monitoring system for intervention plans and (5) establishment of web-based learning communities to expand regional and statewide networking supports. The model design is in place and being implemented in 80 schools. All stakeholders must sign a buy-in agreement in a school before they may request participation in the *Partnering for Success* project.

Links exist between the current initiatives and other restructuring efforts

In Idaho there are a number of initiatives underway or in the planning stages that support the success of all students including students with disabilities. The partners in this proposal have created linkages to each of the initiatives in order to support the current endeavors and to build support for the objectives of this proposal.

The major Idaho Department of Education initiatives include the following:

- *Standards* – Collaborative effort across all instructional bureaus on personnel development, curriculum alignment and development, standards reporting.

- *School Improvement* – collaborative effort with Accreditation, Title I, Bureau of Special Education and Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability on personnel development and school improvement activities.

- *Reading* – Collaborative effort with Idaho Reading Initiative, Reading First, Title I, Special Education, Consortium On Reading Excellence (CORE) on personnel development and reading instruction.

- *Math* – Collaborative effort with Bureau of Instruction, Math and Science Partnership and Special Education on personnel development and math instruction.

- *Idaho Student Information Management System (ISIMS)* – Collaborative effort between the J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Foundation, Idaho Legislature, Idaho Department of Education and school districts on data management, curriculum management, IEP development and management and personnel development.

- *Certification/Personnel Standards Commission* – Collaboration between the institutions of higher education, the Idaho Department of Education, Idaho Department of Health and

Welfare, and the Office of the State Board of Education on personnel development plans, recruitment, retention, and blended early childhood certificate.

- *Results Based Model (RBM)* – Collaboration between Idaho Department of Education, institutions of higher education and school districts on academic and behavioral interventions, progress monitoring, and school improvement.

- *Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC)* – Collaboration between the Bureau of Special Education and the University of Idaho Center on Disabilities and Human Development on access to personnel development.

The Idaho Department of Health and Welfare initiatives that link to the *Partnering for Success* project include of following:

- *Head Start Collaboration Project* – Housed in the Department of Health and Welfare, the project shares information and directs funds to agencies and programs that support children from low income families.

- *Blended Early Childhood Certificate* – Collaborative effort between the Idaho Infant Toddler Program, Idaho Head Start Programs, institutions of higher education, and Idaho Department of Education on implementation of the certificate.

- *Self-Determination Project* – Collaborative effort between the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Council on Developmental Disabilities and Medicaid, Idaho Department of Education, Idaho Legislature, Governor's Office on developing "Independence Plus," a Medicaid waiver to allow self-directed supports for eligible individuals.

The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation initiatives that link to the *Partnering for Success* project include the following:

- *School Work* – Collaborative effort between the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and local districts to provide rehabilitation counselors in local high schools.

- *SILC Transition* – Collaborative effort between the State Independent Living Council (SILC), Idaho Department of Education, and local districts on address issues of self-determination and secondary transition.

The following table illustrates where the initiatives or activities are linked to the proposal project goals:

Table 4: Linkages Between Current Initiatives

Partner/Initiatives	Goal 1: Personnel	Goal 2: Interventions	Goal 3: Transition	Goal 4: Evaluation
Idaho Department of Education Initiatives				
Standards	●	●		●
School Improvement	●	●		●
Reading	●	●		●
Math	●	●		●
ISIMS	●	●	●	●
Accreditation	●	●	●	●
Certification/PSC	●			●
RBM	●	●	●	●
ITC	●	●	●	●
Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Initiatives				
Collaboration Proj.	●	●		●
Blended Certificate	●	●		●
Self Determination			●	●
Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Initiatives				
School Work			●	●
SILC Transition			●	●

C. Project Design

The purpose of the *Partnering for Success* project is to improve and take to scale systems for providing educational, early intervention and transitional services, including their system for professional development and technical assistance and dissemination of knowledge about best practices to improve results for children and students with disabilities. The foundation of the proposed collaborative process uses a multi-pronged approach engaging partners from the Idaho Department of Education, parents of students with disabilities, local school district personnel, higher education faculty, private education foundations, service agencies and community members. The building blocks for the *Partnering for Success* project are (1) an adequate supply of highly qualified special education personnel are working in Idaho schools; (2) provision of training and resources to educate teams, including parents on research based practices and the use of a continuum of educational interventions; and (3) effective secondary transition services provided by education and adult service providers.

The following goals, objectives and activities outline the project's design, implementation, management and evaluation activities. The *Partnering for Success* project will be managed by objectives, which are in turn referenced through the Management Plan, Gantt chart, and person loading chart. Each of the tables is contained in this section.

Goal 1: An adequate supply of highly qualified personnel working in Idaho schools will ensure improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

A critical factor to improving post-school outcomes for Idaho youth with disabilities in is the need to provide each student with a highly qualified teacher. Darling-Hammond (2000) concluded that characteristics of teacher quality, such as certification status and degree in the field to be taught, are very significantly and positively correlated with student outcomes.

Idaho must ensure an ongoing supply of highly qualified teaches in order to improve student outcomes. This will take effort not only to recruit personnel but also to provide the needed supports to retain such individuals through both resources and policy. The professional development structure outlined in the following objectives and activities has been designed to work together to achieve this result.

Objective 1.1: Increase the training and technical assistance capacity of the Idaho Department of Education and partners to provide timely and comprehensive information to educators, agency personnel and parents.

All professional development activities addressed in the *Partnering for Success* project have three similar components (1) creation of a learning community; (2) development of the basic components of the coaching, modeled after the Reading First project; and (3) the development of the basic components of instructional leadership training. Learning communities—based on the concept of "communities of practice" (Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder, 2002)—are groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in the area by interacting on an ongoing basis. There will be several learning communities developed through this project. This objective provides the basic design and structure for the operation of all learning communities.

The training for coaches will utilize the basic components of the Idaho Reading First Project coaching institute. The curriculum at coaching institutes will include the process of instructional coaching, collaborative team building, and data-based decision making. Coaches identified in reading, math and secondary transition will provide leadership, instruction expertise and support to school personnel. This objective addresses the basic components of

training for coaches; content information will be added at the following objective levels: 1.3, - 1.4, - 2.1, 2.2 and 3.1.

In addition to learning communities and coaching, leadership training is an integral part of this system. This objective will (1) provide the overall framework on implementing and sustaining effective scientifically based research programs and (2) address the issues of supervision and support for instructional staff that lead to improved student outcomes.

Activity A: Create a task force and work with the Idaho Training Clearinghouse to reach consensus among the project partners on a shared definition of and a structure for forming learning communities.

Activity B: Utilize the task force of partners (described above) to a develop a shared understanding of and structure for the Coaches training model coordinated with Reading First and state requirements for mentor programs.

Activity C: Develop leadership training and support that enable district administrators to implement system changes that lead to sustainable practices resulting in improved student outcomes and teacher satisfaction.

Partners: Training Clearinghouse, institutions of higher education, Idaho School Administrators Association

Objective 1.2: School districts will actively participate in recruitment activities that result in an increase in the number of fully certificated, highly qualified teachers.

There is a need for improvement in recruitment and retention efforts in targeted school districts. The average number of qualified applicants per vacancy for the special education teacher was 2.18 statewide for the 2002-2003 academic year (Supply and Demand 2002-2003). In an effort to increase the number of applicants, Idaho initiated the Idaho Education Employment Website during 2003. This allows persons seeking employment in Idaho to view postings and to apply on line, but does not generate an applicant bank for districts to more actively pursue available highly qualified teachers. Districts with greater needs must have the ability to aggressively recruit potential employees through a national bank of available and qualified persons. Prior to the state budget cuts in education, larger districts employed recruiters to actively seek qualified applicants. Most of those positions have been eliminated.

Out of desperation, some districts had to employ individuals that were not fully certificated. At the same time, institutions of higher education in Idaho were experiencing budget cuts and were not able to offer accessible course offerings in the evening or week-ends to address the needs of these individuals. The Idaho Department of Education needs to support institution of higher educations with the resources to offer programs that address the work and travel needs of these individuals on emergency certification.

Activity A: Partner with school districts in the state who have a high number school personnel providing special education and related services using emergency certification to identify recruitment needs and select methods to meet these needs.

38

Activity B: Partner with a national web based recruitment system to actively recruit personnel in the areas of need in targeted districts.

Activity C: Partner with Idaho colleges and universities to address the inservice needs for school personnel working toward full certification in special education.

Activity D: Partner with the College of Southern Idaho and all four-year teacher education programs to develop an articulation agreement.

Partners: Institutions of higher education, targeted districts, Idaho Association of School Administrators, Teachers-Teachers.com

Objective 1.3: Beginning special education teachers will receive adequate support from trained coaches leading to increased teacher retention of new personnel in the field of special education in Idaho.

There is a strong correlation between the level of support that special education teachers perceive and their decision to remain in the field (Billingsley, 1991). More specifically, new teachers need support from the administration and fellow teachers to (1) think through conflicts and confusions regarding the demands of their job, (2) assist with prioritizing problems and (3) help resolve interpersonal conflicts (Gersten, Keating, Yovanoff and Harniss, 2001). The contact with the mentor is perceived as most effective if provided by another special educator, contact is weekly and informal in nature and primarily focused on emotional support followed by system information (Whitaker, 2000).

Idaho Code §33-514 requires school districts to provide a support or mentor program for all certificated personnel the first three years they are in the district. However, there is no funding associated with this requirement. Further these mentor relationships have typically not been based upon research of effective practices and often amount to a vague assignment without direction to the mentor or mentee on what is expected.

In this project Idaho will address this need for mentors by providing new special education teachers in targeted districts a trained coach and access to a formal web-based and traditional learning opportunities. The coaches will receive formal training and the new teachers will receive an orientation to the coaching process. Data will be collected at the beginning and the end of the coaching relationship to assist in program improvement.

Activity A: Develop a learning community in partnership with the Idaho Training Clearinghouse to support new special education personnel in Idaho that will include web based and traditional training.

Activity B: Provide a coaching training for coaches of new special education school personnel.

Activity C: Provide training and support to District administrators to regarding the use of coaches and other strategies to improve the retention rate of new hired special education personnel.

Partners: Idaho Training Clearinghouse, school districts, institutions of higher education, Regional Consultants, Idaho Association of School Administrators

Objective 1.4:   Increase the retention and satisfaction of existing special education

personnel.

 State and federal studies have identified several reasons that special education teachers leave the field. These factors include paperwork, caseload size and lack of administrative support. This objective addresses a policy change regarding these factors through the state negotiated rule making process. Establishing caseload sizes in rule will potentially lead to higher teacher retention.

Consistent with national studies, Idaho special education teachers and administrators have indicated that burdensome paperwork associated with documenting IDEA procedures is a contributing factor for teachers leaving special education. Several districts in Idaho have attempted to alleviate this burden by using computerized IEP programs. Through a grant from the J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Foundation, the Idaho Department of Education is developing the Idaho Student Information Management System (ISIMS). ISIMS is designed to provide Idaho parents, teachers and students with the data and knowledge they need to make the best decisions for the individual student. It features a statewide curriculum management and student information system as well as special education evaluation and IEP components.

IEP teams across the state will be able to develop an accurate, yet individualized document that can be accessed by parents, educators and the SDE via the Internet. A professional development team will develop role-based training so that users can utilize the features that relate to their needs.

The purpose of school leadership is to improve teaching and student performance (Reeves, 2002). One of the reasons special education teachers state that they are leaving the field is lack of administrative support. School administrators report that they support special

education teachers, but lack knowledge and understanding of special education issues and requirements. Through this objective, leadership training developed for school administers will increase their knowledge of special education, leading to improved teaching and improved performance on academic measures for student with disabilities.

Activity A: Enter into and complete the negotiated rule making process to address caseload requirements for special education teachers.

Activity B: In partnership with the J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Foundation ISIMS project and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse, develop a learning community to support implementation of the statewide IEP software system leading to a reduction in paperwork.

Activity C: Develop and provide leadership training for school administrators on effective strategies of administrative support for special education personnel.

Partners: School districts, J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Foundation, Idaho Training Clearinghouse, institutions of higher education, Idaho Parents Unlimited, Idaho Association of School Administrators.

Outcome for Goal 1: An adequate supply of highly qualified personnel working in Idaho schools ensure improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Indicators of success for goal one include the following:

Short-Term Indicator: SDE partnerships exist with school districts, adult service organizations, parent organizations, and institutions of higher education.

Intermediate Indicator: Learning communities, coaching, recruitment activities and leaderships training are established and support new special education personnel.

Long-Term Indicator: The identified pool of potential special education personnel exceeds the numbers of special education personnel leaving the field.

Goal 2: Educational teams, which include parents, have the skills and knowledge to provide a continuum of effective educational interventions and supports in reading and math to students with disabilities.

Idaho statewide assessment data clearly indicates that students with disabilities are struggling in reading and math. Some children in the early grades will require intensive, highly individualized instruction from trained teacher specialists to achieve proficiency in reading and math. The National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 found that significant numbers of students in all disability categories function significantly below grade level in reading and math, raising a question about their ability to complete high school work successfully (Wagner, M., et al, 2003). Education personnel must know a continuum of interventions and how best to implement those interventions to help students with disabilities achieve in reading and math at elementary, secondary and postsecondary levels.

Too often, professional development has been a collection of fragmented efforts to improve some aspect of the teaching profession. The mission of professional development in Idaho is to prepare and support educators in helping all student achieve high standards of learning and development (Professional Standards Commission, 2003). Changes in state and federal accountability systems make the need for quality professional development focused on specific teaching strategies to improve student achievement greater than it has ever been in the past. This goal will develop select components of professional development to bring about a *comprehensive* professional development system that leads to improved outcomes for students and greater teacher satisfaction.

Objective 2.1:   Provide training and technical assistance that will facilitate statewide

implementation of instructional practices and supports that are based on

scientific research.

The components of professional development addressed in this objective through

partnerships with the Idaho Clearinghouse and institutions of higher education include the

following: the basic development of learning communities, coaching and leadership training.

These components will be used throughout the project. Learning communities connect

professional development with the expected outcomes of the project. The web-based learning

community, found at the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website, will facilitate the extension

of learning traditionally offered through workshops. This website will connect participants

across the state with similar interests through on-line webcasts, forums, chat rooms and

courses that offer the opportunity for networking without the necessity to travel long

distances.

Coaching is a form of mentoring, but is more focused and usually shorter in duration. It

relies on job-related tasks or skills and is accomplished through an instruction, modeling and

feedback loop. Coaches must be prepared to have a high level of knowledge about specific

skills, as well as the ability to break those skills into discrete tasks, through modeling ,

observing and providing feedback (Gray, 1988; Hopkins-Thompson 2000).

Years of converging research has indicated that commitment from a leader (a principal, in

the case of a school) is critical to reform and, more importantly, to the maintenance of reform

efforts. Where schools are successful in raising student achievement, invariably the principal

is able to motivate staff, to observe and give feedback to staff, and to manage the complex

tasks of scheduling staffing, assessment and instructional leadership in implementing

research-based changes in school policy and procedure. Enabling principals to put instructional leadership first requires intensive preparation and mentoring, as well as flexibility, which allows time for managing the system put in place by reform efforts (Cross & Rice, 2000).

Activity A: Create a Results Based Model work group and a reading/math interventions work group to partner with the Idaho Training Clearinghouse for the purpose of creating learning communities that coordinate the provision of information, training and technical assistance.

Activity B: Develop a network of locally based coaches to provide ongoing instruction, demonstration and feedback to school personnel on reading and math interventions.

Activity C: Develop ways higher education personnel can provide training and technical assistance regarding the Results Based Model, reading interventions and/or math interventions to schools.

Activity D: Provide training and technical assistance that enable school administrators who are implementing the Results Based Model to identify and carry out local systems change (e.g., curriculum, scheduling, teacher allocation) necessary to ensure sustainable practices.

Partners: Center on Disabilities and Human Development, Idaho Training Clearinghouse, institution of higher education, SDE Specialist, Reading First

Personnel, Idaho Association of School Administrators, and Math and

Science Partnership

Objective 2.2: Improve proficiency scores on statewide assessments for all students,

including students with disabilities, by increasing the number of schools

using the Results Based Model (a response-to-intervention program) for the

delivery of services to students with varying instructional needs (e.g., levels

of accommodation and intensity of support).

> **Activity A:** Select 25 schools annually to receive resources, training and
>
> technical assistance on implementing the Results Based Model
>
> (response-to-intervention).

> **Activity C:** In partnership with the Idaho Parent Teacher Association, Idaho
>
> Parents Unlimited, and the Hispanic Community Parent
>
> Resource Center, provide information and joint training on the
>
> Results Based Model and the partners' role on school
>
> intervention teams.

> **Activity D:** Revise the Results Based Model training and technical
>
> assistance to include components in leadership training,
>
> coaching, specific preparation in research-based reading and
>
> mathematics interventions at the early childhood, elementary
>
> and secondary levels.

Partners: Local Education Agencies, SDE staff, Idaho Parents Unlimited,

Gifted/Talented Specialist, institutions of higher education, Regional

consultants, Reading First, Title I, Math and Science Partnership

Objective 2.3: Improve proficiency scores on statewide assessments for all students, including students with disabilities, by implementing coordinated intensive reading and math interventions.

The success of this objective is dependent on the successful collaboration among initiatives aimed at improving student outcomes. The following initiatives are included in this objective: Idaho Reading First, Idaho Reading Initiative, Math and Science Partnership, Title I Family Literacy, Title I Reading Improvement. By collaborating with the stated partners, the Idaho Department of Education can maximize resources and provide consistent professional development opportunities and supports in reading and math interventions to ensure student success.

Schools must engage parents as partners in the education process to advance the attainment of all project goals and objects. Purcell-Gates reviewed early literacy programs that offered direct services to both parents and children (e.g. Even Start), parent education programs (e.g., "First Steps," a pre-reading and reading program for parents), and services offering programs for children. She found "clear benefits to children of family literacy programs of all types" (Purell-Gates, 2000, p.863).

Activity A: Work within the Idaho Department of Education with Title 1, Title II, Reading First, Gifted Talented, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability reading, math and science specialists and institutions of higher education to identify research-based practices that will be implemented consistently across all Department of Education initiatives.

Activity B: Partner with Idaho Reading First and the Idaho Math and Science Partnership to ensure special education personnel statewide will receive training on the agreed upon scientifically based research practices in reading and math including intensive intervention strategies at the early childhood, elementary and secondary levels.

Activity C: In partnership with the College of Southern Idaho, Paraprofessional Training Center, develop and provide training on the paraprofessional's role in the provision of research-based reading and math instruction.

Activity D: In partnership with Idaho Parent Teacher Association, Idaho Parents Unlimited, Native American Families Together Parent Center and the Hispanic Community Parent Resource Center, provide information and joint training on researched-based reading and math and parent involvement, including activities that can be used in the home to support instruction.

Partners: Center on Disabilities and Human Development, Idaho Training Clearinghouse, institution of higher education, SDE Specialist, Reading First Personnel, Gifted Talented Specialist, Idaho Parents Unlimited, Parent Teacher Organization, Head Start Programs, Idaho Infant Toddler Program

Outcome for Goal 2: Educational teams, which include parents, provide effective educational interventions and supports in reading and math to students with disabilities. Indicators of success for goal two include the following:

Short-Term Indicator: Learning communities, training structures, and plan exist statewide.

Intermediate Indicator: All targeted personnel have received training.

Long-Term Indicator: Proficiency scores on special education students' statewide have increased.

Goal 3. Effective secondary transition services and supports will increase the number of youth with disabilities who are actively engaged in postsecondary education, employment and community activities.

Providing secondary transition services that involve youth with disabilities in all aspects of their education is critical to their ability to reach postsecondary goals (Halpern, 1994; National Center on Secondary Education and Transition, 2004). Efforts to address areas of need regarding secondary transition services in Idaho have until recently lacked coordination and intensity. Over the past two years Idaho has laid the groundwork on which future coordinated and collaborative efforts will be able to build. Examples of these building-block activities include collection of postschool outcome data, development of key indicators of secondary transition, professional development in the form of topical mini-workshops, mentoring projects to link high school and university students with disabilities and the formal development of the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition.

Objective 3.1: Education personnel, adult agency personnel and families will be knowledgeable about and will implement effective secondary transition

49

practices that lead to improved postschool outcomes for youth with disabilities.

One of the challenges to providing secondary transition services identified by the National Center on Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET) (2004) is the lack of qualified personnel to address the transition needs of youth with disabilities. In Idaho, the lack of qualified personnel to address transition is exacerbated by insufficient training and follow-up coaching and technical assistance. Personnel preparation focused on secondary transition available at the preservice level is provided only as part of a program leading to a K-12 Generalist Exceptional Child teaching certificate. Teachers at the secondary level attain the majority of their knowledge regarding secondary through on-the-job experiences and short inservice training. Similarly, vocational rehabilitation counselors report that secondary transition is only minimally addressed in their training program provided through the University of Idaho. Providing intensive ongoing opportunities for educators and adult agency personnel to network and obtain information regarding secondary transition is essential to improving special education services in Idaho.

Equally important to successful outcomes for youth with disabilities is the support and guidance they receive from parents and family members. While students are developing their own skills in advocacy, families will continue to play a significant role assisting students with decisions and advocacy. Students themselves report the need for their families to guide and support them as they plan for their future (Morningstar, Turnbull, & Turnbull, 1995).

Partnering for Success will utilize the infrastructure of the Idaho Training Clearinghouse to support the development of a learning community focused on secondary transition. The learning community will provide a mechanism by which educators, adult agency personnel

and families can access information and interactive training and ask questions both through distant learning (e.g., web casts) and traditional formats. A learning community leadership team comprised of higher education faculty, parents and teachers will ensure content quality and the use of research-based practices. In addition, a network of regionally based coaches on secondary transition will provide focused, individualized support to education personnel through instruction, demonstration and high-impact feedback (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000).

Activity A: Create a secondary transition work group that partners with the Idaho Training Clearinghouse to develop a learning community which coordinates the provision of information, training and technical assistance.

Activity B: Develop a secondary transition leadership team to design and deliver ongoing professional development via the learning community regarding effective research-based practices in secondary education and transition.

Activity C: Develop a network of regionally based coaches to provide ongoing instruction, demonstration and feedback to secondary school and partner agency personnel regarding the provision of secondary transition services.

Activity D: In partnership with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) and the Hispanic Community Parent Resource Center (CPRC), increase parents' understanding of and ability to support their child through the secondary transition process by providing parent

51

training on the changing nature of their role and what they can

do to foster self-determination and promote informed choice.

Partners: School districts, IHE personnel preparation programs, Idaho

Interagency Council on Secondary Transition, Idaho Parents Unlimited

(IPUL), State Independent Living (SILC), Idaho Council on Developmental

Disabilities(ICDD), Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation(DVR),

Idaho Training Clearinghouse, Transition Coalition (University of Kansas).

Objective 3.2: Integrate Idaho's Key Indicators of Secondary Transition throughout the

general supervision activities of data collection, child count verification,

district self-evaluation, program monitoring and improvement planning.

Through the state self-evaluation process, the Bureau of Special Education and partners

recommended that key quality indicators be developed for secondary transition that would

assist the state and districts in analyzing areas of success and needs. With assistance from the

Western Regional Resource Center, a cross-agency task force used the Taxonomy for

Transition Programming (Kohler, 1998) to review and analyze existing state secondary

transition policy and interagency agreements to determine their ability to support the

transition process and facilitate the provision of services to children and youth with

disabilities and their families. Recommendations of the task force included identifying

sources of data for each indicator and utilizing the data for long range planning (Storms,

2002).

Activity A: Incorporate the Key Indicators of Secondary Transition and the

Taxonomy for Transition Programming (Kolar, 2000) across the

general supervision activities and continuous improvement

process used by the SDE and school districts in the review of early intervention and special education.

Activity B: Provide training to the SDE, school district and agency personnel and parents on the Key Indicators of Secondary Transition, data sources, data analysis and selection of strategies focused on improving secondary transition services and postschool outcomes for youth with disabilities.

Activity C: Based on the annual review of state and district data regarding secondary students and special education program evaluation, target school districts with high needs and provide them with support and resources to build their capacity with regard to secondary transition services and supports.

Partners: School districts, Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition, institutions of higher education, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, Idaho Parents Unlimited, State Independent Living Council, Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities, Center on Disability and Human Development.

Objective 3.3: Ensure that youth with disabilities have the self-determination skills necessary to improve access to and fully participate in postsecondary education, employment and community activities.

Idaho began collecting postschool outcome data in 2000 through the state Post School Outcomes Longitudinal Study. Information gathered over the past three years from four graduating classes indicates that the pre-graduation expectations of youth with disabilities do

not match the post-graduation outcomes. For example, 57% of the students in the class of 2000 indicated that they were planning on attending postsecondary education or training. One year later when they were surveyed, only 18% were actually enrolled in postsecondary education or training. In a review of national data Horn and Berktold (1999) found that when eighth grade students were asked about their educational aspirations, students with disabilities had lower educational aspirations than their counterparts without disabilities—this was true even among students with disabilities who were academically capable of completing high school.

In 1999, the Council on Developmental Disabilities and the Department of Education established the annual Idaho Youth Leadership Forum (YLF). When delegates to the annual forums were asked to identify the most significant part of their experience, they indicated that meeting and interacting with successful adults with disabilities had the biggest impact on them. One delegate stated, "Before I came to YLF I had goals for myself, but I didn't know how with a disability I would achieve them. Since getting to know adults with disabilities I now know that I can achieve my goals. (Verella, YLF Delegate 2003) "

The activities in this objective address the need for students with disabilities to possess skills that will enable them to actively participate in planning and goal setting, understand their strengths and needs, and advocate for themselves.

> **Activity A:** Provide the opportunity for youth with disabilities to network with each other and with adults with disabilities. through coordinated regional youth workshops that offer information and training on self-advocacy and other life preparation skills.

54

Activity B: Train youth on how to actively participate as a member of the IEP team in transition planning and how to monitor progress toward personal goals.

Partners: School districts, adult service agencies, Idaho Department of Juvenile Justice, IHE Disability Services, State Independent Living Council, Idaho Parents Unlimited, Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities and youth with disabilities

Outcome for Goal 3: Youth with disabilities are actively engaged in postsecondary education, employment and community activities. Indicators of success for goal 3 include the following:

Short-Term Indicator: School personnel have received training on key indicators of quality secondary transition programs.

Intermediate Indicator: Supervision of secondary transition through data collection and state monitoring leads to improved secondary transition programs.

Long-Term Indicator: Youth with disabilities participation in postschool education and training programs and/or postschool employment has increased.

Goal 4. Effectively administer, systematically evaluate and continuously improve the project through partnerships with critical stakeholders.

Objective 4.1: Provide administrative oversight for the State Improvement Grant.

Activity A: Designated Idaho Department of Education staff will oversee and guide implementation of specific project activities.

Activity B: Designated Idaho Department of Education staff will work in collaboration with key project partners to ensure timely and

effective analysis of local data and information leading to fulfillment of partnership agreements.

Activity C: Use a variety of tools including charts, graphs and software to plan, manage and document completion of partnership agreements and project activities.

Objective 4.2: Implement the State level empowerment evaluation plan by using information and data gathered through the local evaluation meetings, and adjust state activities to improve project effectiveness.

Activity A: Create a statewide Evaluation Partnership with key partners to provide to help identify, design and carry out a matrix of evaluation activities to measure process and outcomes of the State Improvement Grant

Activity B: Through three Evaluation Partnership meetings, the Idaho Department of Education, project partners and evaluators will review and evaluate locally gathered data and information results and recommend improvements needed in partner activities.

Activity C: Revise local objectives, activities, budgets, and personnel assignments, as necessary to address local partner recommendations.

Activity D: Create a statewide Evaluation Advisory Committee to provide guidance and feedback regarding statewide evaluation of the project.

Activity E: The Evaluation Partnership will review evaluation results

annually and recommend changes needed in the State

Improvement Grant.

Outcome for Goal 4: Administration and evaluation of project was effective. Indicators of

success for goal four include the following:

Short-Term Indicator: Project management and evaluation plans are developed.

Intermediate Indicator: Established timelines are met and all was completed as outlined.

Long-Term Indicator: Expected outcomes established in the project are met or exceeded

through established partnerships.

D. Project Personnel

A highly skilled cadre of professionals will coordinate, guide, implement and evaluate this project. The proposed project personnel along with their qualifications and roles are outlined below:

Jana Jones, Ed. D., *Project Director:* Jana Jones has been the Idaho Special Education Bureau Chief for 4 years. Prior to her current position Jones served for 11 years as a special education Regional Consultant for Idaho State University providing training and technical assistance to local education agencies.

Russell Hammond, *M.S.S.W., State Improvement Grant Coordinator*: Russell Hammond has been Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Coordinator for the past 5 years and the State Improvement Grant Coordinator since February 1999. He is responsible for ensuring that all activities of the project are accomplished according to the management timeline.

Jacque Hyatt, M.Ed., *Secondary Transition Specialist*: Jacque Hyatt has been employed by the Idaho Department of Education for the past 6 years. Hyatt is a candidate for a Doctor of Philosophy degree from Colorado State University, at Fort Collins, with an anticipated graduation of May 2004. While at Colorado State University, she acquired considerable experience with transition projects and provided instruction to special education and related services providers on best practices in transitional programs. Hyatt has 18 years of experience in the field of special education, including 12 years as a special education teacher. She will be the project lead for the development of a community of learning to improvement the transitional services in Idaho.

Mary Bostick, Ph.D., *Early Childhood Specialist*: Mary Bostick has been an education specialist at the Idaho Department of Education for the past 2 years. She is also responsible for programs related to children's mental health, Autism, and reading. During the past year Bostick facilitated the development of early childhood learning standards and the development of reading academies for primary-level children. Prior to this position she had been a special education regional consultant for 12 years. She also has experience as the education director for a private residential program in Idaho. In the *Partnering for Success* project, Bostick will coordinate the coaching initiatives in intensive instruction in math and reading.

Jean Taylor, M.A., *School Reform Specialist*: Jean Taylor serves as a Special Education Data Specialist for the Idaho Department of Education. She chairs several critical task forces for systems change. Taylor has 16 years of experience in the field of education, including 7 years as a secondary special education teacher and 8 years as an elementary general education teacher. Taylor will help track project results by providing data reports on the key indicators.

 Valerie Schorzman, Ed.D., *Gifted/Talented Specialist*: Valerie Schorzman has recently joined the Idaho Department of Education. For the previous 13 years, Schorzman had direct supervision over the gifted programs in the Port Arthur School District in Texas. These duties included supervising three magnet school programs and the gifted programs at 14 schools. She served as Director of Curriculum and Director of Secondary Education. In this project she will contribute direction on differentiated instruction for students who are gifted as well as having a disability.

Larry Streeter, Ed.S., *Disputes Resolution Coordinator*: Larry Streeter has been employed with the Idaho Department of Education since 1996. He oversees all aspects of the dispute

process in Idaho. He is a person with a visual impairment and represents the Department on the Idaho Commission for the Blind. He recently chaired the "Task Force for the Education of Students Who are Blind or Visually Impaired." He will contribute input in support of advancing transition services for students with disabilities.

Rosemary Ardinger, *State Title 1 Director*: For the past 8 years Rosemary Ardinger has overseen the Title 1 program for Idaho. Prior to this she worked as a teacher, curriculum director, Title 1coach, Title 1 Director and school administrator. Ardinger will provide consultation on selecting schools with the greatest need and on designing intensive interventions in math and reading.

Evelyn Mason, *Executive Director, Idaho Parents Unlimited, INC.* Evelyn Mason has been the executive director of Idaho Parents Unlimited, INC. for the past 2 years. She will ensure that the parent-perspective is represented in all activities of the project, will oversee grant activities and will participate in the project evaluation.

Wayne Callender, Ed.S., *Results-Based Model Coordinator*: Wayne Callender has served as the Results-Based Model Coordinator for the past year. He is responsible for pilot school recruitment, coordinating training, technical assistance and the evaluation of the project. Prior to this Callender worked for 9 years as a school psychologist at the Northeast Kansas Education Service Center in Lecompton, Kansas, where he helped implement a similar problem-solving process for several school districts in that state.

Gerald Nunn, Ph.D., *NCSP, Primary Results-Based Model Consultant*: For the past 7 years, Gerald Nunn has been a Professor and Department Chair of the School of Psychology in the College of Education at Idaho State University in Pocatello, Idaho. Prior to this, Nunn worked in K-12 public schools in Iowa for 15 years as a school psychologist where he assisted in

implementing the IDEAL problem-solving process. Nunn has developed the core training curriculum for the Results-Based Model, has been the principal trainer for pilot schools and conducts an annual process evaluation of the project.

Fred Balcom, Ph.D., *State Improvement Grant Evaluator*: Fred Balcom provides evaluation oversight for the entire Idaho State Improvement Grant in Idaho. Balcom is skilled in using qualitative measures and quantifiable results to evaluate program effectiveness and the development of data systems for use in analysis.

Marybeth Flachbart, M.Ed., C.A.L.T., *Director of Reading First in Idaho*: Marybeth Flachbart is president-elect of the Idaho Branch of the International Reading Association. Prior to joining the Idaho Department of Education Flachbart was a member of the elementary education faculty at Boise State University. Her classroom experience includes 10 years with the Houston Independent School District as a reading specialist and a reading teacher trainer. She holds a Master's degree in Special Education. Flachbart will be a consultant on intensive reading interventions for students with disabilities and on coaching practices.

Tracey J. Meyerhoeffer, M.S., *Director, Paraeducator Training Center, College of Southern Idaho*: Tracey Meyerhoeffer is an assistant professor at the College of Southern Idaho. She has developed the curriculum for the Associate of Applied Science program for paraprofessionals at that college. She will consult with the State Improvement Grant project team and will coordinate the professional development training activities for paraprofessionals. This will include taking the lead in establishing an articulation agreement between two- and four-year programs of teacher preparation.

Cari Murphy, Ph. Ed., *Project Manager, Center on Disabilities and Human Development, University of Idaho, Moscow*: Cari Murphy has coordinated and managed state and federal

grants for over 8 years. Murphy has several years of experience in planning, developing, providing, and disseminating training to adult learners in educational and corporate settings. She has authored training materials, published journal articles and conducted research and evaluation on a variety of topics, including online and web-enhanced training, teaming, conflict management and strategic planning. Murphy will serve as the project manager for the Idaho Training Clearinghouse.

J. Patrick (Pat) White, MA.Ed., *Outreach Programs Coordinator*: Pat White has been the Outreach Programs Coordinator for the Idaho Department of Education since September of 2003. Among other duties for the Department, he is leading a mathematics and science initiative that will support implementation of the federally funded Mathematics and Science Partnership program; development of an Idaho coalition of business, education, and government organizations dedicated to improving science, mathematics and technology education; and piloting a district-level program to assist teachers in aligning mathematics instruction with state standards and assessment. Regarding the State Improvement Grant, White will serve as a consultant concerning research-based practices for the delivery of intensive instruction in math.

Susan Harrington, M.A., Mathematics, *Mathematics and Idaho Math Academy Coordinator, Idaho Department of Education*: Susan Harrington has served as the Mathematics and Idaho Math Academy Coordinator for 4 years. Harrington will provide coordination and between the Bureau of Curriculum and the Bureau of Special Education and will consult on research-based practices in mathematics.

Regional Consultants for the Idaho Department of Education: The Regional Consultants for the Idaho Department of Education are attached to teacher preparation programs across

Idaho. They are liaisons between higher education, school districts and the Idaho Department of Education. They will serve as coaches to targeted school districts to ensure that the project activities are implemented according to the design. The regional consultants are Patricia Farmer, Ed.S., School Psychology and Special Education; Elaine Tobias, Ed.S., Special Education Administration; Kindel Mason, Ed.S., School Administration, at Idaho State University; Elizabeth Bermensolo-Compton, Ed.S., Special Education and Administration; Robin Carter, M.A., Special Education/Early Childhood Education; Wayne Callender, Ed.S., School Administration; Patricia Travers, Ed.S., Special Education, at Boise State University; and Sandra Owen, Ph.D., Special Education and Administration, at the University of Idaho.

Employment of Underrepresented Groups

The Idaho Department of Education (SDE) has a strong history of employing individuals from underrepresented groups. The Department's mission in meeting the needs of individuals with disabilities elevated the focus to recruiting and accommodating employees with disabilities.   The SDE in partnership with the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), the Idaho Department of Human Resources, and the Idaho Industrial Commission work to locate and hire qualified individuals with disabilities. In support of increasing access to state agency jobs, Idaho adopted the Alternative Hire Administrative Process. Through this process, a state agency works with IDVR to identify open classified state positions and to locate individuals with disabilities for employment.

E. Adequacy of Resources

1. **Adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies and other resources**

Federal and state funding provides the Idaho Department of Education with sufficient resources to maintain the office space, equipment, supplies and the other supports needed to accomplish the goals of the proposed project. The Idaho Department of Education, including the Bureau of Special Education, maintains 15,918 square feet of office space on the second floor of the Len B. Jordan building in Boise, Idaho's capital city. This fully accessible building is located in the heart of the state and federal government area of downtown Boise, across the street from the Idaho Statehouse. The Idaho Department of Education shares the building with several other state agencies, including the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

The Idaho Department of Education contracts with the three state universities in Idaho— Idaho State University, Boise State University, and the University of Idaho—to provide technical assistance to school districts. Contract funds are used to employ nine regional consultants. These regional consultants have a special role to play in building relationships between higher education, local education agencies and parents. These strong relationships play an important role in their ability to provide technical assistance and support regarding each goal of the proposed project.

However, the Idaho Department of Education will need to expand its capacity if it is to fully implement the ambitious goals of the proposed project. This will involve creating time for current staff to work on the goals of the proposed project by contracting out some of their existing responsibilities. Also, the position for a project secretary will be continued. The funds

needed to do this are described in the proposed budget contained in this section of the application. Additional training dollars will be used to provide project staff with the skills and knowledge they need to implement the goals of school reform. Also, the Idaho Department of Education will need to enhance its infrastructure if it is to accomplish the goals of the project. As reflected in the budget of the proposed project, resources will be directed at basic operating activities such as postage, phone and office supplies. Last, resources need to be allocated to support the activities of the proposed project's partners, e.g., travel, stipends, etc.

Networking and collaboration among various bureaus of the Idaho Department of Education are other forms of support available to the project. The Idaho Department of Education staff will provide expertise in reading and math and in increasing the number of community contacts willing to help meet project goals. Through staff members' work with the Bureau of Special Education, Personnel Standards Commission and institutions of higher education, connections have been made with those focused on the preparation of teachers. Collaboration with the Reading First Initiative, Math and Science Partnership, Idaho Reading Initiative, Family Literacy, Indian Education Committee, Hispanic Education Task Force, and Title 1 have provided the foundation for development of intervention strategies in reading and math that are responsive to all students. The Bureau of Special Education and has worked closely with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Department of Health and Welfare and the Department of Labor in formulating an interagency agreement that will facilitate improved transition services for students with disabilities.

2. Relevance and commitment of each partner to the implementation and success of the project

A broad array of important partners is strongly committed to the proposed project. The specific nature and extent of their involvement are discussed in their Letters of Commitment in Appendix C. In Idaho, as in many other rural states, meaningful cooperation between agencies has become a matter of course. The Idaho Department of Education already has an excellent working relationship with all of the required partners critical to the success of the proposed project. This atmosphere of cooperation has allowed the Idaho Department of Education to recruit several optional partners and gain their commitment to implementing the proposed project. Having all of the important partners committed to the proposed project at the onset offers the promise that its ambitious goals will be realized. This section describes the relevance of both required contractual and optional partners to complete the goals articulated in the previous sections of this proposal. The nature and extent of the involvement of these partners are described below.

3. Required Contractual Partners

Local Education Agencies

Along with parents, local education agencies are the Idaho Department of Education's most important partners for achieving the goals of the proposed project. Without significant involvement of local education agencies, the proposed project could not accomplish its goal of improving results for children. To reflect this priority, the first goal of the proposed project is to improve the ability of local education agencies to recruit and retain fully qualified personnel. Several school districts have already committed to using web-based recruiting

66

resources and developing mentoring supports for teachers new to the field of special education and/or the district.

Parent Training and Information Center

Idaho's federally supported parent training and information center, Idaho Parents Unlimited, Inc., is considered to be a critical partner in the development and implementation of the proposed project and is therefore listed as a required partner. An Idaho Parents Unlimited representative has participated in all planning meetings for the proposed project. The Idaho Parents Unlimited staff provided important information about the training needs of parents and contributed ideas for effectively delivering training to parents. Further, Idaho Parents Unlimited provided the Idaho Department of Education with valuable guidance about how to develop and disseminate informational materials to parents in the appropriate format. Idaho Parents Unlimited has committed to an aggressive dissemination campaign of information about the results of the proposed project.

4. Institutions of Higher Education

The institutions of higher education have been and will continue to be integral partners in the conceptualization and implementation of the proposed project and are therefore listed as required partners. Representatives from institutions of higher education also provided guidance about how universities and community colleges can be involved in delivering inservice training to the proposed project's target audiences.

Publicly Funded Teacher Preparation Programs

Idaho's publicly funded four-year teacher preparation programs located at Idaho State University, Boise State University, University of Idaho, and Lewis-Clark State College has each committed to partnering with the Idaho Department of Education to (1) increase access

to preservice and inservice training programs; (2) develop training modules that prepare educators to provide, and parents to support, the delivery of effective instruction in math and reading; (3) work on grant initiatives such as Results Based Model, IEP software implementation, intervention strategies, and secondary transition; and (4) participate in the implementation, evaluation and improvement of this project by providing supporting data and participating in three project review meetings per year.

Idaho Center on Disabilities and Human Development

   The Idaho Center on Disabilities and Human Development is the university-affiliated program at the University of Idaho that serves the entire state. The Center conducts a variety of activities in the areas of research, training, dissemination and services. In the former State Improvement Grant the Center developed the Idaho Training Clearinghouse, which is designed to link professionals and parents with training opportunities across the state and to create an online training community among trainers and participants. In the *Partnering for Success* project the Clearinghouse function will expand to (1) develop and deliver online training modules in support of the learning communities identified in the project proposal and (2) provide multiple-point web conferencing to expand the ability to provide frequent coaching to school teams.

The College of Southern Idaho

   The College of Southern Idaho developed the Paraeducator Training Center, which is a certificate/degree-granting career ladder program. The College of Southern Idaho offers an inservice training package available to districts to assist with meeting the requirements of No Child Left Behind Act. Recently, the Paraeducator Training Center has assisted in training

paraeducators from 33 districts. As a partner in this grant, the College of Southern Idaho will, as part of the Associate of Arts Degree for educational assistants, provide training in the delivery of math and reading instruction and take the lead in developing curriculum alignment between all two-year and four-year teacher preparation programs in Idaho.

5. Other Contractual Partners

The Idaho Association of School Administrators

The Idaho Association of School Administrators represents over 750 school administrators, superintendents, directors of special education and elementary and secondary principals. Its board of directors and membership are committed to the *Partnering for Success* project. The Idaho Association of School Administrators interacts with all of the major policy-making bodies concerned with the education of children and has agreed to work with the staff of the proposed project to implement policy-related project goals. The Idaho Association of School Administrators has long recognized the importance of involving parents in educational programming and has agreed to help recruit parents to participate in the activities of the proposed project. The Idaho Association of School Administrators will commit resources to increasing the availability of qualified personnel.

Center on Reading Excellence

The Idaho Department of Education will be utilizing Part VI-B funding to contract with the Center on Reading Excellence to conduct statewide training for elementary and secondary teachers on reading instruction.

Teachers-Teachers.com

Teachers-Teachers.com offers an effective solution to districts seeking to recruit special education teachers. School districts can advertise vacancies to a national pool of candidates

and proactively recruit candidates by searching a robust database of resumes. Teachers-Teachers.com will partner with the Idaho Department of Education in selected high-need school districts to recruit highly qualified special education personnel to work in Idaho.

Fred Balcom

Dr. Balcom has been the external evaluator for the previous State Improvement Grant in Idaho. He is skilled in using qualitative measures and quantifiable results to evaluate program effectiveness and the development of data systems used for analysis. He has consulted on the evaluation design for this project and will facilitate the formative and summative evaluation process.

6. Other Partners

Office of the Governor

Idaho Governor Dirk Kempthorne is committed to improving results for all students. In this spirit, he has demonstrated strong support for the proposed project and will remain involved through the Idaho State Council on Developmental Disabilities. Governor Kempthorne will be instrumental in leveraging education policy-makers to form partnerships that hold all students accountable for meeting high academic standards.

Lead Agency for Part C, the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare

The Idaho Department of Health and Welfare is the lead agency for Part C services in Idaho. The Department's Part C component, the Idaho Infant and Toddler Program, is a significant partner and has committed its resources to support the recruitment of highly qualified early childhood educators and the advancement of early literacy skills for children.

General Education and Special Education Teachers

The Idaho Education Association has committed to partner with the Idaho Department of Education and other project partners to create learning communities to support the retention of special education personnel and to provide input toward the resolution of high caseload sized for special education teachers.

Special Education Advisory Panel

The Special Education Advisory Panel is another important entity that is committed to the goals of the proposed project. The Special Education Advisory Panel, which by law must be comprised of a majority of parents and individuals with disabilities, as well as state agency representatives, has been involved in the development of the proposed project. The Special Education Advisory Panel will play a significant role in implementing the proposed project. Overall, the Special Education Advisory Panel will monitor all of the goals and review evaluative data about the performance of the *Partnering for Success* project. A member of the panel will serve on the Evaluation Advisory Committee.

Interagency Coordinating Council (Part C)

The Interagency Coordinating Council has demonstrated its commitment to improving results for children since its inception. For example, the Interagency Coordinating Council has formed a consortium of early childhood personnel to initiate statewide efforts to reform early childhood services. The consortium is working to develop and gain approval for a blended general and special education certification for early childhood specialists. The Interagency Coordinating Council has always supported the idea that the highest personnel standards must be maintained in the provision of services to young children The Interagency Coordinating

Council has stated its strong commitment to involving parents in the provision of early childhood services.

Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

In terms of school-to-work transition services for students with disabilities, the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is a critical partner to the *Partnering for Success* project. The Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation will help conduct joint training activities designed to improve how students with disabilities transition from school to work and adult life. Also, the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation will allow its 62 local and regional counselors to participate in professional training activities with students with disabilities, educators and parents.

Idaho State Independent Living Council

The State Independent Living Council endorses the goals of the proposed project. The State Independent Living Council is dedicated to making independent living a reality for Idahoans with disabilities. The State Independent Living Council has committed to assisting the Idaho Department of Education in conducting joint training activities in the area of secondary transition, particularly in the area of self-determination. The State Independent Living Council will assist the Idaho Department of Education in connecting youth with disabilities with adults with disabilities and by offering self-determination training. This high level of commitment by the State Independent Living Council is based on its belief that improving results for students with disabilities will increase their opportunities for higher education and meaningful employment.

Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections

The Bureau of Special Education and the Department of Juvenile Correction have collaborated to provide regional meetings to improve mechanisms to provide supports to youth before commitment to Juvenile Corrections and to youth returning to their communities. The Department of Juvenile Corrections, which serves as a school district in Idaho, has aligned its curriculum with school districts. This agency has committed to assisting in the development of the secondary transition learning community by participating as a member in the training development team.

Parents of Children with Disabilities

Besides representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited, other parents of students with disabilities have been and will continue to play a pivotal role in the development and implementation of the proposed project.

7. Potential for Continued Support

The excellent relationships between the Idaho Department of Education and the various partners of the *Partnering for Success* project holds the promise of ongoing support for the goals of the project beyond the lifespan of the grant. In particular, the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Infant and Toddler Program, the State Council on Developmental Disabilities, and other organizations are and will continue to be committed to the overall of goal improving results for children and youth with disabilities. In particular, the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Infant and Toddler Program are committed to improving transition services for children and youth with disabilities.

8. Incorporating Project Results in Existing Systems

Embedding many of the policies and practices developed as part of the *Partnering for Success* project into existing educational systems will result in maintenance of project services to children and youth with disabilities well into the future.

9. Extent the budget is adequate to support the project

The budget has been determined based upon estimates provided by contractual partners or by the knowledge of usual consultant fees, stipends, office operation costs and travel expenses for personnel in Idaho.

10. Extent the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design and significance of the project

All costs have been reasonably calculated to accomplish the objectives, design and significance of the project.

11. Partnership Agreement

It is evident, based on the needs assessment conducted for the *Partnering for Success* project, that the Idaho Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education, cannot meet the needs identified in this proposal without a variety of strong partnerships. The success of this grant depends upon the effectiveness of partners who are committed to the same vision and goals which coalesce around one easily understood precept: all students must receive the supports needed to achieve meaningful postschool outcomes. Partnership agreements have been developed to demonstrate this commitment. In the project design, critical partners are identified for each objective. Partnership agreements, found in Appendix C, describe the role of each partner in the grant. These agreements will be revisited throughout the life of the grant to address any unanticipated issues. Included in the agreement to partner with the Idaho

Department of Education is the commitment to provide data and to meet face to face or via

conference call up to three times per year to ensure smooth and timely implementation.

F. Management Plan

The proposed project will be manages and administered by the Idaho Department of Education. The Bureau Chief of Special Education will have responsibility for project oversight and fiscal matters in coordination with the State improvement Grant Coordinator. The State Improvement Grant Coordinator will manage the project as outlined, liaison with state and federal agencies; adhere to timelines and preparation of reports and communication with partners. All fiscal activities performed by staff of the grant will be completed in accordance with the controller for the Idaho Department of Education. All accounting procedures are in accordance with EDGAR.

This section includes a Person Loading Chart, a table displaying the Management Plan, and a Task Timeline Chart. The Person Loading Chart exhibits a list of project personnel and the percentage of time they will devote to each goal of the proposed project. The Management Plan illustrates each of the objectives of the proposed project, the measures of success, the entity responsible for completing each objective, and the funding source for each objective. The Task Timeline Chart provides a more detailed picture of the timelines for each objective of the proposed project. The project manager will use these tools to ensure the goals and objectives of the proposed project are being completed as planned. It should be recognized that many of the proposed activities will overlap or will occur concurrently.

The management of the project is integrated with the evaluation plan, using process evaluation to continually evaluate timelines and activities, review progress and evaluate the achievement of project outcomes.

MANAGEMENT PLAN

Goal 1: An adequate supply of special education personnel, ensure improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

Short Term: SDE partnerships exist with school districts, recruitment organizations, and institutions of higher education.

Intermediate: Coaching, new teacher support, ISIMS training, learning communities established and support personnel.

Long Term: The pool of potential special educators exceeds the number of special education personnel leaving the profession.

Objectives	Success Indicators	Status	Responsible	Funding
1.1: Increase the training and technical assistance capacity of the SDE and partners to provide information and training to educators, agency personnel and parents.	▪ Learning community structure done ▪ Coaching structure developed ▪ Leadership training/TA structure in place		**Hammond** **ITC** IASA Reading First	SIG Reading First Part B
1.2: School districts will actively participate in recruitment activities that result in an increase in the number of fully certificated, highly qualified teachers.	▪ Recruitment needs identified ▪ Districts use web-based recruiting ▪ Teachers using emergency certification access classes ▪ Articulations agreements in place		**Hammond** **LEAs** IHEs	SIG

Objectives	Success Indicators	Status	Responsible	Funding
1.3: Beginning special education teachers will receive support from trained coaches increasing teacher retention	▪ Learning community is used ▪ New teachers receive support ▪ Retention rate of new hires improves		**Hammond** **ITC** SDE Regional Consultants	SIG Part B
1.4: Increase the retention and satisfaction of existing special education personnel	▪ Caseload rule adopted ▪ Paperwork reduced ▪ Administrators are supportive		**Hammond** **Jones** IASA Albertson's	Part B SIG Albertson's Foundation

Goal 2: Educational teams, which include parents, have the skills and knowledge to provide effective interventions and supports in reading and math to students with disabilities.

Short-Term: Training structures and plans exist statewide.

Intermediate: All special education personnel have received training.

Long-Term: Proficiency scores on special education students' statewide assessments have increased.

Objectives	Success Indicators	Status	Responsible	Funding
2.1: Provide coordinated delivery of information, training and technical assistance that builds capacity for statewide implementation of research based practice.	▪ Learning communities developed ▪ Coaches providing TA ▪ IHE faculty providing TA ▪ Systems change occurred in schools		**Callender** Hammond SDE Regional Consultants IHEs	SIG Part B
2.2: Improve proficiency scores on statewide assessments increasing the number of schools using the Results Based Model.	▪ 75 schools new schools use RBM ▪ Parents are active team members ▪ RBM manual address system needs		**Callender** IPUL LEAs	Part B SIG
2.3: Improve proficiency scores on statewide assessments of students by implementing coordinated intensive reading and math interventions	▪ Reading and math interventions consistently implemented ▪ Teachers trained, students scores improve ▪ Para's understand their role ▪ Parents use strategies at home		**Bostick** CORE Reading First CSI SDE Regional Consultants	ESEA Reading First SIG Part B

Goal 3. Effective secondary transition services and supports will increase the number of youth with disabilities who are actively engaged in postsecondary education, employment and community activities.

<u>Short-Term:</u> School personnel have received training on key indicators of quality secondary transition programs.

<u>Intermediate:</u> Supervision of secondary transition through data collection and state monitoring leads to improved transition programs.

<u>Long-Term:</u> Special education students' participation in post-secondary education and training programs and/or post-school employment has increased.

Objectives	Success Indicators	Sources	Responsible	Funding
3.1: Education, agencies and families will receive training on the key indicators and strategies for implementing effective practices.	▪ Learning community developed ▪ Effective transition provided ▪ Coaching provided ▪ Parents foster self determination		**Hyatt** ITC LEAs IPUL	Part B SIG WIA
3.2: Integrate Idaho's Key Indicators of Secondary Transition into general supervision	▪ Key indicators are incorporated ▪ Data is used to analyze services ▪ Effective transition is provided		Hyatt Taylor SDE Regional Consultants	SIG Part B WIA

3.3: Youth with disabilities have self-determination to participate in postsecondary education, employment and community.	▪ Youth practice self-advocacy skills ▪ Youth are active participants in their IEP planning		**Hyatt** IHEs Voc. Rehab LEAs IPUL	SIG WIA

Goal 4. Effectively administer, systematically evaluate and continuously improve the project through partnerships with critical stakeholders.

Short-Term: Timelines for products, meetings, and reports is established.

Intermediate: Appropriate changes are made in response to changing needs shown in reports and data.

Long-Term: Increase in student performance attributable to SIG efforts.

Objectives	Success Indicators	Dates	Responsible	Funding
4.1 Provide administrative grant oversight	▪ Goals are completed and met		**Jones**	SIG
4.2 Implement the plan using info/data gathered through local evaluation meetings, adjust activities to improve project.	▪ Evaluation teams in place and meet ▪ Partners analyze data and changes are made as needed		**Hammond** Jones Taylor	SIG

Goal 1Task Timeline Chart

Timelines and Milestones for Accomplishing Tasks

Goals/Objectives/Activities	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
Timeline Years by Quarters	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Goal 1: Adequate supply of highly qualified personnel												
1.1: Increase training and TA												
1.1.A: Create task force	X	X										
1.1.B: Develop coaching structure	X	X										
1.1.C: Develop leadership training			X	X								
1.2: Participate in recruitment												
1.2.A: Identify recruitment needs	X				X				X			
1.2.B: Partner with web-based firm	X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
1.2.C: Partner with universities - inservice			X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
1.2.D: Partner with CSI - articulation	X	_	_	_	_	_	_	X				
Obj. 1.3: Teachers receive support												
1.3.A: Develop learning communities			X									
1.3.B: Provide coaching training-new staff				X				X				X
1.3.C: Provide leadership training					X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Obj. 1.4: Increase retention												
1.4.A: Caseload rule making	X	_	_	X								
1.4.B: Develop IEP learning community			X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_

Goals/Objectives/Activities												
1.4.C: Provide IEP leadership training			X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_

Goal 2 Task Timeline Chart

Timelines and Milestones for Accomplishing Tasks

Goals/Objectives/Activities	Timeline Years by Quarters											
	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Goal 2: Effective interventions and supports in reading and math												
2.1 Provide coordinated RBM training												
2.1.A: Create RBM learning community			X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
2.1.B: Develop network of RBM coaches			X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
2.1.C: Develop IHE support for RBM			X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
2.1.D: Provide RBM leadership training			X	_	_	_	X	_	_	_	X	_
2.2: Increase number of RBM schools												
2.2.A: Select 25 new RBM schools/year	X				X				X			
2.2.B: Partner with families on RBM		X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
2.2.C: Revise training for system change			X	X								
2.3: Implement intensive interventions												
2.3.A: Identify research-based practices		X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
2.3.B: Provide training on practices			X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
2.3.C: Provide para training on reading/math			X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
2.3.D: Partner with parents on interventions			X	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_

Goal 3 Task Timeline Chart

Timelines and Milestones for Accomplishing Tasks

Goals/Objectives/Activities	Timeline Years by Quarters											
	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Goal 3: Increased number of youth in post secondary education or employment												
3.1: Implement sec. transition practices												
3.1.A: Develop learning community			X	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3.1.B: Develop transition leadership team	X	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3.1.C: Develop transition coaches			X	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3.1.D: Partner with parents on transition	X	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3.2: Integrate key transition indicators												
3.2.A: Incorporate indicators in monitoring	X	–	–	–	X							
3.2.B: Provide training on indicators			X				X				X	
3.2.C: Identify districts for transition funds			X				X				X	
3.3: Ensure youth can self-determine												
3.3.A: Provide opportunity for networking				X	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3.3.B: Train youth on transition planning			X				X				X	

Goal 4 Task Timeline Chart

Timelines and Milestones for Accomplishing Tasks

Goals/Objectives/Activities	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Goal 4: Administer and evaluate the project												
4.1: Provide administrative oversight												
4.1.A: Designate staff management team	X	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4.1.B: Collaborate with partners as agreed	X	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4.1.C: Use tools to manage activities	X	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4.2:Implement empowerment evaluation												
4.2.A: Create Evaluation Partnership	X	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4.2.B: Meet to evaluate project progress		X	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4.2.C: Revise activities, budgets as necessary				X				X				
4.2.D: Create Evaluation Adv. Committee		X	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Person Loading Chart - Professional Staff Assignments and Total Time Committed

Staff Member	Goal 1: Personnel	Goal 2: Interventions	Goal 3: Transition	Goal 4 Evaluation
J. Jones				.20
R. Hammond	.20	.15		.40
J. Hyatt			.40	.10
B. Bostick		.20		.10
J. Taylor				.20
L. Streeter				.05
V. Schorzman				.05
W. Callender		.80		.20
L. Wyer				.25
B. Leavitt	.20	.40	.10	.30
P. Farmer	.15	.20	.15	.05
K. Mason	.15	.20	.15	.05
E. Compton	.15	.20	.15	.05
R. Carter	.15	.20	.15	.05
T. Travers	.15	.20	.15	.05
S. Owen	.15	.20	.15	.05
E. Tobias	.15	.20	.15	.05

<center>**G. Project Evaluation**</center>

Evaluation data will assist in identifying strategies that are effective in creating sustained systemic change resulting in improved postsecondary outcomes for students with disabilities. The components used to evaluate this project include the following: (1) a logic *model* that evaluates both "process" and "outcome" and (2) a logic *matrix* that identifies outcomes and indicators, data sources. These evaluation components offer a collaborative approach necessary in evaluating complex systems change and comprehensive improvement initiatives such as those proposed in this project.

1. Project Evaluation Logic Model

The logic model developed for this project is called the Project Evaluation Logic Model. It is based in part on Fetterman's empowerment evaluation, which can "generate opportunities and encourage risk taking, exploration, and the development of abilities" for all project partners (Fetterman, 1993). Data gathered for statewide evaluation reporting based on the Project Evaluation Logic Model will be used for two levels of evaluation: process accountability and outcome accountability (Friedman, 2002). The Project Evaluation Logic Model (see Appendix D) includes three cycles: development, empowerment evaluation and outcome evaluation.

a. **Development Cycle**

During this cycle, data was collected from the Idaho Department of Education and partner agencies concerning the following areas: geographic and demographic challenges, early intervention, special education, general education, parent involvement, state compliance, professional development, student needs. Based on an analysis of the data, needs were

<center>87</center>

identified and prioritized. The Department has completed the development cycle of the model.

b. **Empowerment Evaluation Cycle**

During the empowerment evaluation cycle, the SDE and the partners developed goals based on prioritized needs. The SDE and the partners then identified project activities to meet these needs and linked the activities to existing initiatives. The SDE, the partners, and the evaluation facilitator *continually* review and monitor project activities through "process evaluation."

What does it measure? Process accountability is primarily concerned with determining (1) whether or not the *efforts* put forth in project activities are being implemented in a timely and efficient manner and (2) whether or not short-term indicators are being met. Process accountability will be accomplished through formative evaluation and will be conducted throughout the project's existence. Process evaluation will review the progress and compare activity outcomes with those proposed in the project design.

Use of data in process accountability: Two major questions dictate the manner in which the process evaluation occurs: (1) How much service did we deliver? and (2) How well did we deliver it? Partners in project activities will form an Evaluation Partnership. This Evaluation Partnership will meet with the project evaluator three times a year to review data and answer these questions. At least one meeting per year will be conducted using video conferencing via the Idaho Training Clearinghouse. Based their review, the SDE and project partners will then consider the project activities and make necessary revisions to sustain change and support local capacity development.

c. **Outcome Evaluation Cycle**

Outcome evaluation takes place at the end of each year and at the end of the project. The process is driven by expected outcomes for each project goal, which includes short-term, intermediate and long-term indicators.

What does it measure? Outcome accountability measures the *effect* of the project activities on the expected changes and on whether or not anyone is better off as a result of the project. Summative evaluation will be used to analyze data and report on outcome accountability. Summative evaluation will measure the identified outcomes and indicators using both qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques. The Project Evaluation Logic Model will be used to provide organization and structure when evaluating the impact of the project and when charting progress toward intermediate and long-term indicators on the Project Evaluation Matrix.

Use of data in outcome accountability: Two questions will dictate the manner in which the outcome evaluation occurs: (1) How much effect/change was produced? and (2) Is anyone better off? An Evaluation Advisory Committee will meet once a year with the project evaluator to review the annual summative evaluation report and make recommendations to the Idaho Department of Education and partners on changes needed in the project. The summative evaluation reports will be provided to the Office of Special Education Programs at least annually or as required.

2. *Project Evaluation Matrix*

The Project Evaluation Logic *Model* works in conjunction with the Project Evaluation *Matrix,* which identifies the outcomes, indicators and data sources used to guide the evaluation process. The matrix is grounded in both formative and summative evaluation functions. It

provides an effective method for charting progress from initial and short-term project

outcomes toward intermediate and long-term indicators. This matrix focuses on identifying

the logical links between the desired outcomes, the project assumptions or theories, and

project strategies or services (Peisher, Sewell, Kirk, 2001). Table 5 on page 92 shows the

format of the Project Evaluation Matrix. Appendix D is the actual Project Evaluation Matrix

that identifies the outcomes, indicators and data sources.

3. *Data Sources*

Seven sources of data may be used throughout the project to gather data for the process

and outcome evaluation process:

(1) *Needs assessment* – Ongoing data collection of training needs gathered through the

established mechanisms in the Idaho Training Clearinghouse.

(2) *Tracking database* – Utilization of existing personnel and student databases to monitor

state/district personnel needs, student academic progress, postsecondary outcomes,

and graduation/dropout rates. These are presented at least annually in district and state

performance goals and indicators reports.

(3) *Observations* – Regular observations of project participants as they implement the

various activities in the project will occur to monitor progress.

(4) *Surveys/questionnaires* – Surveys and questionnaires used for general supervision

monitoring as well as other specific surveys developed as part of the project will be

used to gather quantitative and qualitative data for the project.

(5) *Evaluation* – The Evaluation Partnership meeting three times a year and the

Evaluation Advisory Committee meeting once a year will monitor and guide the

project using the empowerment cycle shown in Appendix D.

(6) *Records* – Written records that will yield quantifiable data about project outcomes, will be used to monitor progress. This may include training evaluations, project activity reports, anecdotal information on student successes, etc.

(7) *Product Evaluation* – Trainin*g* modules and resource materials developed over the course of the project will be evaluated in terms of content, ease of use, and lack of bias. Identified users and potential users of the materials will be given written evaluation forms to complete as they review the materials.

Table 6: Project Evaluation Matrix

Goal	Outcome	Short-term	Intermediate	Long-term	Data Source
Goal 1: Personnel					
Goal 2: Interventions					
Goal 3: Transition					
Goal 4: Management and **Evaluation**					